Poetic Memory

ALLUSION IN THE POETRY OF CALLIMACHUS

AND THE *METAMORPHOSES* OF OVID

BY

HEATHER VAN TRESS

BRILL MNEMOSYNE · SUPPLEMENTA

POETIC MEMORY

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER • H.S. VERSNEL

I.J.F. DE JONG • P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, SPUISTRAAT 134, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM QUINQUAGESIMUM OCTAVUM

HEATHER VAN TRESS

POETIC MEMORY

POETIC MEMORY

ALLUSION IN THE POETRY OF CALLIMACHUS AND THE *METAMORPHOSES* OF OVID

BY

HEATHER VAN TRESS

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2004

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 14157 X

© Copyright 2004 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For my parents and for my husband

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ix

Chapter One Callimachus, Ovid, and Allusion 1
1. Introduction: Callimachus' and Ovid's "Callimacheanism" and Allusion 1
2. Genre and Allusion 4
3. Theories of Allusion: The Approaches 7
4. Organization of the Study 21

Chapter Two A Well-Defined Scope: Lexical Integrative and Reflective Allusions in the Prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia* and the Proem of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 24
1. Introduction: Proems and Prologues 24
2. A Brief History of Interpretations 26
3. *Διηνεκές* 31
4. *Perpetuum Carmen* 39
5. *Λεπτός* 43
6. *Deductum* 55

Chapter Three Broadening the Scope: Marking the Allusion and Reiterative Integrative and Reflective Allusion 72
1. Introduction 72
2. An Overview of Callimachus' *Lavacrum Palladis* 73
3. The Sources for Callimachus' Tiresias and Actaeon 75
4. An Overview of Ovid's Tiresias and Actaeon 80
5. The Sources for Ovid's Tiresias and Actaeon 81
6. Marking the Text 84
7. Callimachus' Reiterative Reflective Allusions 88
8. Ovid's Reiterative Integrative and Reflective Allusions 97
9. Allusive Manipulation of the Texts 105
10. Conclusion 110

Chapter Four Variation of the Trope: Reflective and Integrative Allusion and Authorization within Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* and Ovid's Book 6 of the *Metamorphoses* 111
1. Introduction 111
2. An Overview of Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* 113

3. Other Occurrences of Asteria and Leto 114
4. Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*, the Hymnic Tradition, and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 116
5. Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* and Pindar's Poetry 126
6. Conclusion I 134
7. An Overview of Ovid's Asterie, Delos, Niobe, and Latona 136
8. Other Occurrences of Asterie, Niobe, and Latona and the Lycian Colonists 138
9. Ovidian Allusion in *Met.* 6.108-383: Asterie, Niobe, and Latona 141
10. Conclusion II 158

Chapter Five Boundaries of Genre? Allusion and Genre 160
1. Introduction 160
2. Two Erysichthons 162
3. Sources for the Erysichthon Tale 164
4. Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*, Integrative Allusion, and the Dislocation of Genre 167
5. The Preparatory Allusions 169
6. Callimachus' Erysichthon and Homer 171
7. Conclusion I 178
8. Ovid's Erysichthon, Homer and Virgil 180
9. Ovid's Reflective Allusions to Callimachus 185
10. Conclusion II 189

Chapter Six Conclusion 191

Bibliography 197
1. Bibliography of Editions Consulted 197
2. General Bibliography 198

Index of Passages Cited 207
General Index 215

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study began during two extremely challenging and engaging graduate seminars and one series of lectures given in the academic year of 1994 -1995. In the fall semester of 1994 Professor E.B. Holtsmark led a group of students through the entirety of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and a considerable amount of contemporary scholarly literature. My love of Ovid's art is due to Professor Holtsmark's quiet but infectious enthusiasm. My fascination with poetic allusion began later that same fall when Professor Stephen Hinds gave a series of lectures on Ovid and allusion. The spring of 1995 brought with it another very challenging and inspiring seminar on Hellenistic poetry, given by Professor Mary Depew. Few people can make such a difficult subject as interesting and enjoyable as Professor Depew.

The years since the fall of 1997 have been spent in the Netherlands, and the Radboud University Nijmegen has aided me considerably in the continuance of my study and work. Professor A.H.M. Kessels has invested innumerable hours in this work over the course of the past six years, reading and commenting on every version of this study. Professor M.A. Harder, of the University of Groningen, has also read and commented extensively on this book; her help has been invaluable. The detailed suggestions of Professor R. Nauta, also of the University of Groningen, has made this a better book. Thanks must also be given to two other classicists at the Radboud University Nijmegen, Professor A.P.M.H. Lardinois, whose enthusiasm and inspiring ideas have improved this work immeasurably, and Dr. V.J.Chr. Hunink, whose sharp eye and astute commentary have been extremely helpful. Many thanks go to the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). This organization believed in my research and made a luxurious six-month sabbatical and the completion of this project possible.

Finally, I would like to thank Ms Gera van Bedaf and Mr Michiel Klein Swormink at Brill for all of the time and energy they have put into this book.

CHAPTER ONE

CALLIMACHUS, OVID, AND ALLUSION

mortalia facta peribunt,
nedum sermonum stet honos et gratia vivax.
multa renascentur quae iam cecidere, cadentque
quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus,
quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi.

But all that mortals make will die,
much less will the glory and lively charm of language
remain. Many words now perished will be reborn and
others will perish that now hold worthy places;
use determines this, use which possesses the authority,
law and standard of our speech.
(Horace *Ars Poetica* 68-72)

Introduction: Callimachus' and Ovid's "Callimacheanism" and Allusion

Due to its complexity Callimachus' poetry is difficult to briefly characterize, though the words "recondite" and "recherché" recur in secondary literature concerning his work.[1] While in one sense these adjectives hit the mark, in another they are unfair and overlook the revolutionary nature of his poetry. To this description one should add that Callimachus' poetic language is precise—every word counts—and that he seems to have been self-consciously re-working traditional material into a new, contemporary mode. In his poetry he revises the orthodox conception of genre by, for example, inserting into one generic form the meter and subject matter of another.[2] The end result of his

[1] E.g. Clausen (1964), 183; Pfeiffer (1968), 125-126; Bulloch (1989), 9-12; Parsons (1998), 132, 137-138.

[2] See e.g. Kroll (1924), for his influential *Kreuzung der Gattungen* in connection with Ovid's poetry. Rossi (1971) relates this *Kreuzung* to the bookishness of the Hellenistic age, while Fantuzzi (1980), Schwinge (1981), and Zanker (1987) offer more

experimentation is that his poetry never ceases to surprise the reader with the unexpected. His poems are filled with unusual tales, linked together in startling ways, and though he freely alludes to and adapts the work of other poets, verbal borrowings are rare. Throughout this poetry of novelty rooted in "the traditional" the reader is constantly aware of the self-conscious display of the learned poet himself.[3]

Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is said to be a Callimachean poem, but what do scholars mean when they use the term "Callimachean"? Though some use this term indiscriminately,[4] many scholars employ it to express the general notion that Ovid's epic is similar to Callimachus' poetry in subject matter and general poetic style. Most of the *Metamorphoses'* stories, like those of Callimachus, are aetiological or are novel

---

recent discussions on the mixture of genres. Gutzwiller (1997) and Greene (2000) discuss the *genus mixtum* of Hellenistic poetry of Anyte, Erinna, and Nossis. See Harder, Regtuit, Wakker (1998), for studies concerning genre in Hellenistic poetry, as well as Depew and Obbink (2000), whose book provides generic investigations spanning various periods of ancient literature. Other scholars reject the notion that the *genus mixtum* was a product of the Hellenistic age; see Hutchinson (1988), 199-201 and Bulloch (1985), 31ff. On the other hand, Harder (1998), 95 regards the *Aetia* as a "kind of generic catalogue in which the old literary genres are an object of reflection" and has distinguished three categories of generic allusion.

[3] For more general descriptions of Callimachus' poetry see Trypanis (1958), vii-xiv, and Parsons (1998), 132-138. For a more detailed description of his poetry see Bulloch (1989), 9-30 and Hutchinson (1988), 26-84.

[4] In some secondary literature concerning Ovid's *Metamorphoses* the terms "Alexandrian", "Hellenistic", and "Callimachean" often appear to be used interchangeably to describe the epic. Several years ago, in the context of Callimachus' influence on Latin poems, Clausen (1964), 187, wrote "[i]t is a mistake, not uncommon in our literary histories, to employ the terms 'Hellenistic', 'Alexandrian', 'Callimachean' interchangeably. The poetry of Catulus, Valerius Aedituus, Porcius Licinus, and Laevius might be called Hellenistic; but it had little to do with the New Poetry, which is Callimachean in inspiration." More recently Thomas (1993), 198 has reiterated this concern and has written that "[a]t times in discussions of Roman poetry even the term 'Callimachean' seems to mean little more than 'clever', 'very Callimachean' little more than 'very clever', and in such cases it does not seem to matter whether the cleverness has any specific connection to Callimachus", but later adds that "we use the word 'Callimachean' [....to indicate] a programmatic attitude, stylistic outlook, or general poetic and scholarly position". Some scholars are more discriminate with modifiers and describe the *Metamorphoses* as a whole as "Hellenistic" or "Alexandrian", Martini (1933) and Myers (1994), 15. The linking narrative structure is described as "Hellenistic" by Wilkinson (1953), 235-236; Kenney (1992, repr.), 764; Knox (1986), 6; Hutchinson (1988), 329; Myers (1994), 15; though Heinze (1919) and Otis (1970, second ed.), 46-47, believe that the epic's narrative style is not "Hellenistic" (or "Callimachean"). Lafaye (1904), 8-12; Galinsky (1975), 1-2; Knox (1986), 18, 67-69, 75-79; Myers (1994), 15, categorize the *Metamorphoses* as "Hellenistic" in its choice and treatment of, and focus on, mythology, while Knox (1986), 1-6; Solodow (1988), 24-25; Myers (1994), 15; believe that the epic's mixture of genres may be attributed to a general influence of Hellenistic poetry.

versions of traditional myths; both poets share a similar narrative style and an interest in generic mixture, and just as Callimachus seemingly loves to surprise his reader, so too does Ovid.[5] However, in light of Ross' view that each generation of Latin poets, from the neoterics to Statius, created "a different image of Callimachus according to the needs of their own verse, an image which often had little resemblance to the original,"[6] to what extent must Ovid's poetic technique be similar to Callimachus' in order for him to be considered "Callimachean"?[7] Or, to rephrase the question, if Ovid viewed Callimachus' poetry through the lens of his own Latin predecessors, to what degree is his poetry "Callimachean" or "Hellenistic"?

This study does not intend to dispute the view that the *Metamorphoses* is a poem influenced by Hellenistic poetry in general, and Callimachus' poetry in particular. Nor does it intend to redefine our conception of Callimachus' poetry. Instead, it hopes to enhance the current conception of Callimachus' poetry, particularly within three of his hymns and the *Aetia* prologue, to deepen our understanding of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and to explore possible similarities of compositional patterns by focusing on *one* aspect of their poetic technique at a few illustrative *loci*: poetic allusion, its construction, deployment, and the similar as well as dissimilar effects achieved via allusion within the texts of these two authors. Though only one facet of poetic technique, by its very nature poetic allusion informs the engaged reader of the intended or unintended interrelationship of texts. For this reason an investigation into the manner in which Callimachus and Ovid allude, especially at points where their texts intersect, may prove illuminating. Moreover, most studies offering a systematic typology of allusive activity have focused primarily either on Hellenistic or Neoteric or Augustan poets; few have employed one typology to compare the referential activities of a Greek and Latin poet equally, side by side. This

---

[5] See Harder (2003), who details how in his *Aetia* Callimachus "seems to manipulate the past, present and future in such a way that a picture emerges of a world in which there is a certain tendency towards expansion, progress and civilization supported by the adherence to specific moral values" (304), and who sees Ovid's reception of this poem suggests that "Ovid too may have observed the notion of progress and a chronological climax in Callimachus" (305).

[6] Ross (1975), 142.

[7] The definition of "Callimacheanism" is further complicated by the fact that each generation of poets consulted Callimachus' poetry as well as the interpretation and use of Callimachus (and other Hellenistic poets) by their immediate predecessors. See Hutchinson (1988), 283 and Thomas (1993), 201-202.

study, then, will attempt to give a partial answer to the question of the "Callimachean" nature of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, will examine and compare the allusive techniques of two poets separated by approximately two hundred and fifty years, by their cultures, and their languages, but who have long been linked to one another.

Before we consider poetic allusion as an artistic phenomenon and how scholars have understood it within the context of Greek and Latin poetry, it is necessary to justify the boundaries of the texts examined in this study and to address the issue of genre. Ovid wrote another, more obviously "Callimachean" poem that has received some attention,[8] and he allied himself to Callimachean poetics in work prior to his epic.[9] The *Metamorphoses*, however, with its seemingly ambiguous, "Callimachean" and simultaneously "un-Callimachean" proem, yet overall "Hellenistic" nature, is more interesting ground on which to test the similarities of Ovid's and Callimachus' poetic techniques. The seemingly odd selection of Callimachus' work examined in this study is mainly due to the comparative paucity of this poet's extant poetry and plethora of Ovidian material. All of these facts urge me to set the boundaries of the study to include only the *Metamorphoses* and all extant poetry of Callimachus.[10]

Genre and Allusion

This study explores allusions that occur at points of intersection between poetic texts of different genres: epic and elegiac, as well as epic and hymnic. As we shall see, Callimachus' and Ovid's allusions to poetic and prose texts "outside" and "inside" the genres of their own poetry, as well as the categorization of their own texts, often have a significant impact on the understanding of the operation of the allu-

---

[8] The aetiological nature of the *Fasti* was clearly influenced by Aratus's *Phenomena* and Callimachus' *Aetia*. See Kenney (1982), 132-134. For recent studies covering the Callimachean nature of the *Fasti* see Miller (1976); Miller (1992), 11-32; and Harrison (1993), 455-457.

[9] Most notably at *Am*. 1.1.1-4.

[10] The reader of the *Metamorphoses* and Callimachus' poetry often comes across points at which, due to the fragmentary nature of much of Callimachus' work, the texts intersect only briefly. This usually necessitates only suggestive, speculative remarks. The intersections of texts discussed in this study are those that I believe to be the most complete, and are, hopefully, less speculative. For lists of parallels between Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Callimachus' extant poetry see De Cola (1937), 126 and Pfeiffer (1953), 136.

sions and the text surrounding them. Therefore, it is important first to understand to what extent the concept of genre, as we think of it today, was a part of Callimachus' and Ovid's poetic consciousnesses.

Today we define genre as "a grouping of texts related within the system of literature by their sharing recognizably functionalised features of form and content".[11] Genre is not simply a matrix with which scholars categorize literature, it is, perhaps more importantly, a manner in which texts may be inscribed so that they may communicate certain expectations to readers in order to guide their understanding. Furthermore, genre is never fixed; it should be "viewed both diachronically as a series of evolving and developing forms and synchronically as a set of contrasting and complementary relationships—fluid, not fixed—between genres coexisting in a given period".[12] Generally speaking, this is the modern conception of genre. How might Callimachus and Ovid have viewed genre?

There was no theory of genre in antiquity, and what discussions of specific literary genres do survive are few and incomplete. This would make sense given that Greece was an oral culture until the late Classical period[13] and that "a poem existed for and through [its] performance; the literary genera in fact reflect different conditions of performance".[14] The first theories of genre arose once the performative conditions could no longer be met.[15] For example, in his *Respublica* (3.392d-394c) Plato classifies poetic genres according to the rather unbalanced criteria of modes of presentation.[16] Only in Aristotle's *Poetics* do we find an outline of a more complex theory that takes form, content, psychology of author and audience, meter, language, performance, tradition, and evolution into consideration.[17] Unfortunately, this analysis focuses only upon epic and tragedy. During the Hellenistic age philologists, scholars (such as Callimachus) and librarians began to classify earlier literature and, one would theorize, their own. This process necessitated the need

[11] Conte and Most (1998), 301.

[12] Gutzwiller (1991), 9; see also Gutzwiller's background of twentieth century generic theory (1991), 3-13.

[13] Depew and Obbink (2000), 3.

[14] Burkert (1987), 49; see also Depew and Obbink (2000), 3; Conte and Most (1998), 302.

[15] Compare with Nagy's, (1990), 362 n. 127 formula: "the very concept of genre becomes necessary only when the occasion for a given speech-act, that is for a given poem or song, is lost."

[16] Plato asserts that there are three poetic genres: mimetic (tragedy and comedy), diegetic (dithyramb), and mixed (epic).

[17] Conte and Most (1998), 301.

to distinguish literature using formal and thematic constants that poets could recognize as "rules" for genre. Concerning this development of the concept of genre, Rossi's formula seems most appropriate: in the Archaic period generic laws were unwritten but respected; in the Classical period the generic laws were written and respected; and in the Hellenistic period they were written but not respected.[18]

Little remains of how Roman poets approached generic theory. Accius wrote: *nam quam varia sint genera poematorum, Baebi, / quamque longe distincta alia ab aliis,<sis>, nosce* ("recognize, Baebius, that there are various kinds of poems and that some are very distinct from others..." [Accius Fr. 8 (*Didascalica*) = Charisius, Gramm. 141.34 Keil]),[19] and Horace's *Ars poetica* tells us only what he considered appropriate style and content. The Augustan poets, deeply influenced by their Hellenistic predecessors, display an interest in genres and their boundaries that suggests familiarity with generic theory. Virgil's *Ecl.* 10, for example, explores the relationship of elegy and pastoral, while Ovid's *Heroides* and *Remedia amoris* evidence his experimentation with "new" and paradoxical genres.[20] As we shall see, the generic classification of his *Metamorphoses*, the proem of which is one of the focal points of one chapter of this study, has proven to be extremely interesting to scholars for the past century.[21] Our modern interest in generically classifying his epic, as well as the generic experimentation seen in his other work, indicates that Ovid was very much aware of genre. There is, therefore, no avoiding the issue of generic allusion in a discussion of Ovid's allusive techniques. The same may be said of any treatment of Callimachus allusions. What we know of Callimachus' literary production for the Library in Alexandria suggests that he too had to be part of the Hellenistic process of generic distinction and classification.[22] Several recent studies demonstrate awareness of genre

[18] Rossi (1971), 69-94.

[19] Text is that of Dangel (1995).

[20] Conte and Most (1998), 301.

[21] Chapter Two, pp. 26-28. See also Hinds (2000), 221-223 for a very concise overview of the positions on genre scholars of the past 100 years have taken.

[22] We know that Callimachus wrote some eight hundred books, among them prose works on nymphs; on athletic contests; on the foundation of islands and cities; on winds; on rivers; on marvels; on birds; on barbarian customs; and on the local names of fish and months. He was one of the founders of lexicography and paradoxography, and wrote the *Pinakes*; it is this work that suggests that he had a great interest in generic classification of literature.

within his own poetry,[23] and as we shall see, this consciousness has an impact upon the allusions he creates in his poetry.

Theories of Allusion: The Approaches

In an attempt to better understand and describe poetic allusion to others, readers from antiquity up to modern times have devised various taxonomies that employ nomenclatures, each name of which ideally represents the interaction of two (or more) texts. Each taxonomy tends to be the product of, and is often a reaction to, the one preceding it, and, as one might expect, the multi-faceted nature of allusion frequently defies rigid systematization. Each approach, therefore, has limitations, some more serious than others.

A point at which we may begin the discussion of theory of allusion is classical theory, which recognizes two types of allusion: *μίμησις* or *imitatio*, and *ζήλωσις* or *aemulatio.*[24] *Imitatio* is the process by which the writer selects a model and simply copies its best features. A rather simple example of this is the following verses of "Musaeus" (Fr. 5d = A2 Colli):

> *ὣς δ' αὔτως καὶ φύλλα φύει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα·*
> *ἄλλα μὲν ἐν μελίῃσιν ἀποφθίνει, ἄλλα δὲ φύει·*
> *ὣς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπων γενεὴ καὶ φῦλον ἑλίσσει.*
>
> And even so the fruitful land produces leaves;
> Some die away in the manna ash tree, while others grow;
> just so revolve the generations and the race of men.

The poet here clearly refers to and somewhat rewrites the Homeric simile likening generations of men to generations of leaves (*Il.* 6.146-149). It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between *imitatio* and *aemulatio*, since they are complementary and may be synonymous as well. Generally speaking, however, we may say that *aemulatio*, on the other hand, is usually more complicated and requires that the writer attempts to surpass his model in some way. He might find fault with a passage and try to improve upon it in his own work, or he might add to

[23] Concerning the references to various genres Callimachus makes see Harder (1988); Depew (1992); Fuhrer (1993); Krevans (1993); Andrews (1998); Harder (1998); and Harder (2002).

[24] On these and other classical terms distinguishing allusive types see Reiff (1959).

it in a way he finds unique, or both. We find an example of this type in an elegiac fragment of Mimnermus emulating the same Homeric simile (Fr. 2.1-8):[25]

ἡμεῖς δ', οἷά τε φύλλα φύει πολυάνθεμος ὥρη
ἔαρος, ὅτ' αἶψ' αὐγῇς αὔξεται ἠελίου,
τοῖς ἴκελοι πήχυιον ἐπὶ χρόνον ἄνθεσιν ἥβης
τερπόμεθα, πρὸς θεῶν εἰδότες οὔτε κακὸν
οὔτ' ἀγαθόν· Κῆρες *δὲ παρεστήκασι μέλαιναι,*
ἡ μὲν ἔχουσα τέλος γήραος ἀργαλέου,
ἡ δ' ἑτέρη θανάτοιο· μίνυνθα δὲ γίνεται ἥβης
καρπός, ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ γῆν κίδναται ἠέλιος.

But we are like the leaves that flowery spring
puts forth, quickly spreading in the sun's warm light:
for a brief span of time we take our joy
in our youth's bloom, the future, good or ill,
kept from us, while the twin dark Dooms stand by,
one bringing to fulfillment hard old age,
the other death. The ripeness of youth's fruit
is short, short as the sunlight on the earth.

Mimnermus' poem continues for eight more lines, listing the horrors of old age, as is his wont, but in these verses we recognize the allusions to Homer. Several times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* men's lives are compared to that of leaves, but Mimnermus' lines appear to be modeled on those same lines referred to by "Musaeus", i.e. *Il.* 6.146-148:

οἵη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν
φύλλα τὰ μέν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δέ θ' ὕλη
τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη·

Such as are the leaves' generations, so are men's.
Some leaves the wind casts down, others the forest
brings forth in flourish, and the time of spring appears.

Mimnermus' first four verses clearly recall these three of Homer, but he uses the Homeric image differently. In the epic the succession of generations of men is compared to the seasonal changes of the leaves, and the point is the transience of life. In Mimnermus' allusion we see that it is the brevity of youth that is compared to the swift cycles of nature.[26] But the poet's *aemulatio* does not stop there. In his second

---

[25] See Sider (2001), 281-283. For Mimnermus's use of the epic tradition see Griffith (1975), 73-88. Translation is that of West (1993), 28.
[26] Campbell (1967), 226.

four verses he alludes to another scene in the *Iliad* that involves two fates, Achilles's speech to the embassy.[27] In this speech Achilles reminds the men that he has two fates, διχθαδίας κῆρας (*Il.* 9.411), both of which end in death, θανάτοιο τέλοσδε (*Il.* 9.411). But while Mimnermus has made what seem to be two allusions to the *Iliad*, he has significantly altered the ideas of those referenced passages. We remember that for Achilles each fate has an attraction; should he choose a noble life, he will die early, and should he choose a late death, he will live a long, undistinguished life among family and friends. Mimnermus's verses admit nothing pleasant about either fate.

If we accept that the unknown elegiac poet and Mimnermus allude to Homer, how do we describe the mechanism of these allusions? It seems that "classical theory" and its terminology are not sufficiently nuanced to accurately describe the interaction of the texts. Recently two scholars, Garner and Conte, both writing about allusion in different contexts, have explained the mechanics of it similarly. Stated briefly, an allusion functions like a metaphor.[28] The metaphor is created when one term, in its old sense or previous usage, is dislodged and transferred to a new, seemingly "improper" or "strange" sense or usage. When the reader encounters a metaphor, the flow of the statement is broken by something "improper" or "strange" that cannot be understood literally; it forces the reader to go outside the text to interpret it. Sentences such as "her hands were frail" or "her lips were red" the reader can quickly accept as fact, but when I write, "her hands were ancient parchment against mine" or "her lips were red plums on a cinnamon and chocolate backdrop", the reader must pause and consider why hands can be like parchment and why lips are like plums. The object (or idea) under consideration is called the "tenor," and that thing to which it is compared the "vehicle." What the tenor and vehicle have in common is called the "ground" or "neutral term(s)". In the above example the tenor is the hands, while the vehicle is the ancient parchment. The ground, something that is often very elusive, is here age, fragility, and soft texture.

---

[27] Garner (1990), 4.

[28] Whereas Garner (1990), 1-5 immediately compares the mechanics of allusion to that of metaphor, Conte (1986), develops the notion more slowly, first positioning allusion within poetic memory (23), then comparing its function to classical trope (where his terminology parallels that of Garner) (23), then more specifically to a rhetorical figure (38), and finally to metaphor (52-3). Both of these classical scholars seem to have been influenced by the work of Richards (1963 repr.), whose terminology (i.e. tenor, vehicle, ground, gap or tension) they employ.

The tenor, vehicle, and ground are all static elements of a metaphor, but there is also a dynamic aspect that must be interpreted; this is called the "gap", "tension", or "ungrammaticality". This can be defined as the failure of the statement on a literal level, or the puzzle that a metaphor presents. The gap or ungrammaticality stops the flow of the narrative because the reader must pause to make sense of it. Thus in the example above, the reader stops because he recognizes that hands are not parchment. But after consideration, the reader may interpret the sentence and come to a new, more complex understanding.

These terms have been applied to allusions as well. The primary text is the tenor, the text alluded to the vehicle, what the two texts share is the ground, and some ungrammaticality, some gap[29] in meaning forces the reader to stop and consider the text more carefully, hopefully coming to a deeper understanding of what has been read. In the case of a metaphor the gap or ungrammaticality is a sort of puzzle, such as an inappropriate word or words oddly combined, or even a statement that is literally incorrect, which interrupts the narrative flow. With allusion the ungrammaticality need not be something that does not make sense; it can also be the *familiarity* of a collection of words or of lines in a poem. For example, the fragment of Mimnermus above is the primary text, or tenor, the *Iliad* is the vehicle. The ungrammaticality or gap that prompts the reader to pause is the general familiarity of the lines combined with something unusual that Mimnermus inserted – the two equally unpleasant fates. One might consider the ground, or what the tenor and vehicle share, the concept of two fates and leaves compared to men's lives. Perhaps there is something more. One could also add that both poets compare the seasons to the stages of human life. There are differences between the two texts as well; what of them? One of Mimnermus's primary points is that spring, or youth, is the best season of human life, but Homer concentrates on the cyclic nature of leaves and men's lives. Thus while alluding to Homer twice, the focus of both his metaphors is different from the vehicle, the Homeric texts. However, someone else might explain Mimnermus's two allusions to Homer, and even the Homeric text, quite differently. For example, it is possible that a reader of Mimnermus' poem misses the "ungrammaticality", and therefore misses the allusion to Homer entirely.

---

[29] In an attempt to use terminology more helpful for a discussion of allusion (not metaphor or simile), some refer to the "ungrammaticality" as a "gap" or a "trigger"; see Garner (1990), 6.

From this example alone, then, it is clear that allusions are open to interpretation. Furthermore, poets can manipulate this basic formula laid out above. By their very nature allusions multiply the possibilities and difficulties present in metaphors and similes because the text of the tenor and the text of the vehicle have contexts that should be considered. In an attempt to better understand allusion, and perhaps in an attempt to avoid potentially confusing terminology, scholars, most often working within either Greek or Latin literature, have systematized them variously by constructing typologies of allusion.[30]

Pasquali's work on allusion within the poetry of Virgil, Horace, and Callimachus seems to be the basis from which most modern scholars start.[31] His famous article, "Arte allusiva", laid the foundations for what most present-day scholars accept to be true about allusions: that allusion is a central part of all poetry, that allusion was a very important part of a poet's repertoire, and that the reader who misses an allusion misses part of the meaning of that poem. Much of the terminology used today to discuss allusion originated from Pasquali's work. However, his historicizing approach, i.e. the notion that no allusion could be properly understood unless one recovers and reconstructs the cultural context of that poet, poses problems for the modern reader. The interpretation of an allusion can be dramatically altered by various readings of a particular point in history, and a person writing in the early twentieth century would have a rather different view of ancient history in light of his own contemporary history than a person writing at the beginning of the 21st century.[32] Also problematic is Pasquali's tendency to view all allusion as emulative:[33] one text stands in a position of *aemulatio* to another, which is particularly true in his examinations of Hellenistic poetry, a poetry that he characterizes as re-elaboration and reworking. As Conte points out, Pasquali fails to distinguish between emulation and allusion. Emulation, according to Conte, is a type of allusion, but all allusion is not emulative.[34] Pasquali's view reduces the

[30] Or to express this differently, scholars have attempted to organize allusions into categories to help the reader understand the "gaps" and "grounds" of allusions.

[31] This is particularly true of his article of 1942. Pasquali's work is the first to confront allusion as an artistic phenomenon in general. The studies of de Jan (1893), Perrotta (1924-26), and Herter (1929), examine individual instances of allusion.

[32] Some critics find this aspect of Pasquali's approach problematic for this reason; e.g . Conte (1986), 24-26.

[33] Conte (1986), 26.

[34] Conte (1986), 36.

"meaning" of an allusion to a poet's intention—notoriously difficult to define—at a particular point in time.

With his work in Hellenistic and Neoteric poetry, Giangrande, who cites Pasquali as his guide,[35] has taken the study of allusion in another direction. Giangrande and his school have focused less upon a literary-historical approach to allusion and more upon lexical matters, such as how the Hellenistic poets used Homer as a source for their own poetic language.[36] Giangrande has written on the creation of new forms based on Hellenistic usage, as well as on Hellenistic allusions that point to textual variants in the poems of Homer ,[37] while the commentaries of his students often focus on the use of *hapax legomena*, formulaic language, and other aspects of Homeric style.[38] Giangrande concentrates upon one allusive technique he calls *oppositio in imitando,*[39] which he maintains is a mode of reference employed by Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes. These poets would allude to a Homeric formula, or a particularly Homeric word, in order to express their opinions about original readings. Sometimes Callimachus or Apollonius alluded to one form in contrast to another chosen as the "correct" reading by another scholar-poet. For example, Giangrande writes "If Homer says *ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα* (formula), Apollonius will say (*Arg*. 1.725) *ἐς ἠέλιον ἀνιόντα*; if Homer has the verb *ἐκκυλίνδω*, Callimachus will use *εἰσκυλίνδω* (*Hymn* 4.33); if Homer has (*Hymn. Ap*. 459) *ὁππόταν ἐκ πόντοιο*, Callimachus will say *ὁππότ' ἐς Ὠκεανόν* (*Hymn*. 4.17; *ἐς Ὠκεανόν* taken from *Il*. 1.423); if Homer has *ἐπιδινηθέντε* (*Od*. 2.151), Callimachus will write *ὑποδινηθεῖσα* (*Hymn*. 4.79)."[40] This type of rigorous philological method applied to allusion, while extremely useful for our understanding of one aspect of Hellenistic poetry, is nar-

[35] Though Giangrande (1967), 85 adds that methodologically Herter (1929), offers the best approach. The approach of Livrea (1972) is very similar to Giangrande's.

[36] Following Pfeiffer (1955), 72 and (1968), 123-124, Giangrande and his school appear to view Callimachus' poetry as the product of the scholar-poet, and thus treat it accordingly. Of course there is no question that Callimachus was a scholar, but one might question whether his poetry should be treated as the work of a scholar.

[37] Giangrande (1967) and Giangrande (1970).

[38] See Williams (1978) and Bulloch (1985).

[39] Giangrande (1967), 85 who cites as his source Kuiper (1896), 114. As we shall see shortly, Thomas (1986), 171 calls this type of allusion "correction."

[40] Giangrande (1967), 85.

rowly focused and cannot be applied consistently to the full range of allusion in Hellenistic or Latin poetry.[41]

Clausen's "Callimachus and Latin Poetry" took the study of allusion within Latin poetry in another direction, and has been proven extremely influential in how the Augustan and Neoteric poets are viewed in relation to each another, and in how we currently consider their mode of allusion.[42] In this article Clausen states that, contrary to the traditional literary history of his time, a continuous line can be traced from the Neoterics through to the Augustan poets. This line was drawn by one man, Parthenius, who introduced Cinna, Calvus, Catullus, Gallus, and Virgil to Callimachus, as well as to other Hellenistic poets.[43] In Clausen's view, for one of these poets to allude to any of the Hellenistic poets was to declare independence from the native Latin tradition of glorification of a patron's military exploits. What counted, however, was not to whom the poet made reference, but the manner in which the reference was made. When an Augustan poet alluded to an archaic poet, this allusion was not a reaction against the Hellenistic sensibilities of the Neoterics; instead the manner in which the references were made indicates the Callimachean and Neoteric basis of Augustan poets. While this study offers many sensitive readings of allusion in Latin poetry, its intention was not to systematically classify allusion. This task was taken up by one of Clausen's students, D.O. Ross.

Focusing on Latin poetry, Ross continued to refine and embellish the broad concepts set up by his teacher, first by using the stylometric method of Bertil Axelson to define the essential characteristics of Neoteric poetry.[44] In doing so he identified two poetic styles employed by Catullus: the innovative neoteric style based on Alexandrian ideals which is found in the polymetric and longer poems, and the older, traditional native Latin style of the epigrams. In his subsequent book, Ross then turned to the examination of Neoteric language and thematic motifs found in the poetry of the Augustans.[45] The methodology employed here parallels Giangrande's, but Ross places his findings in a literary-historical frame similar to Clausen's.

---

[41] Farrell (1991), 14 states that while one might apply *oppositio in imitando* to a few cases of allusion in Virgil's poetry, the allusive type by no means accounts for all the manners in which this particular poet alludes. The same may be said of all poets.

[42] Clausen (1964).

[43] Clausen (1964), 187-188 and (1982), 5-7, and more recently Lightfoot (1999), 9-16, 50-76.

[44] Axelson (1945); Ross (1969); See Benediktson (1977) for objections.

[45] Ross (1975).

In his commentary on Virgil, Richard Thomas, a student of Ross, continues to refine the conception of allusion in Latin poetry and discloses an attitude towards Virgilian allusion identical to that elaborated by Clausen and Ross, i.e. Virgil is Neoteric and Callimachean in the extreme.[46] Using excerpts from the *Georgics* in his article of 1986 Thomas establishes a typology of allusion, though his primary interest is in allusion as an illustration of a poet's mastery over the literary past.[47] He divides allusion into six distinct types: casual reference, which he defines as the use of language to recall a specific antecedent in a general sense only; single reference, which is the reader's recollection of a single *locus* so that he may apply that context to the new situation; self-reference, which recalls a *locus* in a poet's own work; correction, which demonstrates the poet's scholarly aspect in the unmistakable indications of a source he then contradicts or alters (this type of reference is essentially the same as Giangrande's *oppositio in imitando*, and reveals the poet's competitive attitude to the literary past); apparent reference, which is a context that seemingly recalls a specific model but which frustrates that expectation on closer inspection; and finally, conflation or multiple reference, which is a reference that recalls a number of antecedents and subsumes these versions and traditions of these versions into a new text. This typology works well within the context of Virgil's *Georgics* and would appear to prove his point that in this particular poem the integration of all these allusive types the poet matches and surpasses the Alexandrians in complexity of allusion. However, one might question whether these well-defined categories, which were devised to elucidate the referential tendencies of one Roman poet in one poem, would be suitable for the analysis of one of his poetic predecessors and one of his poetic successors, both of whom had a different relationship to their literary pasts, and different styles of writing.[48] In short, it seems that Thomas' typology might so well-suited for Virgil's *Georgics* that it would not be appropriate for an analysis of Callimachus' and Ovid's allusive techniques.

---

[46] Thomas (1988).

[47] Though Thomas (1986), 172, n. 8 rejects the term "allusion" in favor of "reference."

[48] Thomas (1986), 173 himself writes that his chosen material was the *Georgics* and not the *Eclogues* or *Aeneid* because the former "still shows some signs of development" in the use of allusion, while the nature of the classicism of the latter prohibits complex allusion. It should be noted that Depew (1998), has used Thomas's typology in her examination of Callimachus' fourth *Hymn*.

Conte's treatment of allusion within Latin poetry, probably the most all-encompassing and systematic, will serve as a model for this study's analysis of allusion because of its simplicity and because this typology attempts to divorce the allusion itself from a poet's intentions, that is to say, because of its refusal to view allusion from the recreated viewpoint of the poet. Furthermore, his typology embraces many Latin poets of various periods and, therefore, suggests that, unlike other systems that have concentrated upon reference within the work of a single poet, the typology may be suitable for analysis of allusion within Greek poetry.[49] Conte considers poetic allusion as only one element of poetry and he situates it within poetic memory and describes it as functionally analogous to a classical trope.[50] In both allusion and trope the poetic text is created by the simultaneous presence of two different realities whose interchange produces a third reality, a single more complex reality. Though Conte sees his work as anchored in the Italian tradition, particularly that of Pasquali, his theoretical approach differs.[51] As we have seen, Pasquali studied instances of allusive art that were, in his view, emulative, i.e. cases in which an allusion displays a poet's intent to compete with and improve upon the original text.[52] Conte, however, sees Pasquali's view as limited because of its reduction of allusion to a moment in poetic production, or to express it in another way, to the moment in time or in a text when a poet seeks to equal or surpass the work of another poet via emulation.[53] Instead, in his series of essays Conte maintains that he wishes to explore the rhetorical function of allusion as an aspect of the "systematic character of literary composition".[54] He strives to concentrate on the texts under examination rather

[49] Conte (1986). Barchiesi (1984), 16, n. 9 explicitly states that his work is based upon the Contean theoretical framework. Within her book on Ovid's *Amores*, Boyd (1997), discusses (among other subjects) Ovid's literary borrowings, applying a criterion of Conte, which she calls the "memorability test", attributing the phrase to Peter Knox.

[50] See Conte (1986), 23-24, 28, who views allusion as a "cog in the general mechanism of textual composition."

[51] Conte (1986), 24.

[52] Cf. Pasquali with Conte (1986), 36.

[53] Bloom's concept of the "anxiety of influence" (1973), would represent a more pure form of the theoretical basis of Pasquali's work. Bloom maintains that poetic influence is in fact a dialectic generated from the poet's inner conflict between needing to be recognized within a literary system and needing to establish his individuality. The poet must express this anxious relationship to his literary past by imitation; either swerving away from earlier models or conforming (completing) earlier models (which Bloom defines as "clinamen" and "tessera" respectively.

[54] Conte (1986), 26.

than the author, on the relation between the texts rather than on imitation, in an effort to escape the trap of viewing every allusion as emulative. The writer's own examples illustrate this point best.[55] The first line of Catullus's c. 101, *multas per gentes et multa per aequora vectus* ("carried through many peoples and many seas"), compares the poet's journey to visit and honor the grave of his brother to that of Homer's Odysseus (*Od.* 1.1-4):[56]

> ὃς μάλα πολλὰ
> πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε.
> πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω,
> πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν.
>
> [Odysseus] who wandered much after he destroyed
> the mighty city of Troy; and he saw the cities of many
> people and learned their minds and on the sea he suffered
> many sorrows in his heart.

In his *Aeneid* Virgil alludes to both the proem of the *Odyssey* as well as Catullus's initial line. Here at the moment of turning from the Odyssean to the Iliadic half of the poem, Anchises in the underworld greets his son Aeneas, who has come to the end of his own wanderings (*Aen.* 6.692-693):

> Quas ego te terras et quanta per aequora vectum
> accipio.
>
> I receive you carried through what lands and over
> how many seas.

Homer established the pattern of the well-travelled and long-suffering hero, and Catullus casts himself as a second Odysseus in such a way that the reader may make other connections between Catullus and the Homeric hero: the general tragedy of the Trojan war and Odysseus's *nekyia*. Virgil's Anchises then portrays his son as an Odysseus and a Catullus – the heroic survivor and the kinsman coming to honor the dead. If we approach these passages from a Pasqualian perspective, we might surmise that both Catullus and Virgil seek to confront and com-

---

55 Conte (1986), 32-39.

56 It is interesting to note that Catullus alludes to a poem that arose from the oral tradition in his own text, which was primarily intended for a reader, not a listener, though no doubt Catullus' poetry was also recited; see Conte (1986), 23-95, who discusses how an allusion may be understood as such by a reader or listener particularly because of the memorability of a group of words and the place of those words.

pete with the Homeric past. However, it seems that neither Catullus nor Virgil appears to be attempting to compete with or surpass Homer. Instead, both poets allude to the opening lines of the *Odyssey* in order to make the image of Odysseus well up in the reader's mind, and to enrich the verses of their own poetry by infusing it with aspects of another poem. Generally speaking, if the reader approaches any given text without the assumption that poets only seek to emulate and compete with other poets, then the possibilities of interpretation multiply and poetic texts become richer.

Conte subdivides allusion into two groups, integrative and reflective allusion, which will be employed in this study as a means of analysing allusion.[57] The former type, integrative, is exemplified by Catullus's and Virgil's allusions to Homer above. As illustrated above, in this type of allusion "two voices dovetail in the poet's new voice. They tend to harmonize and so create a single "word" enriched by an internal resonance. Denotation becomes loaded with an oriented connotation".[58] The integrative allusion evokes a scene, characters or a situation, and the evocation can be incorporated into the text, with the result that it becomes richer and more resonant. The latter allusive type, reflective, may be defined as a "face-to-face dialogue between two voices within the same word, and basic differences prevent the area of overlap from tending toward fusion or interpenetration".[59] This type involves intentional textual confrontation with the result that the reader's attention is drawn to the process of literary creation within the text. In other words, the seams of artistic creation show, and the artifice of artistic production is unmasked. According to Conte, reflective allusion is most often evident in the work of the Alexandrian poets and Ovid. For the purposes of this introduction one of his own now famous examples will be illustrative.[60] In Book 3 of Ovid's *Fasti*, deserted by the god who mar-

[57] Conte (1986), 66-67. Scholars have differing names for similar allusive patterns. Thomas's "casual reference" and "single reference" are roughly comparable to Pasquali's "*aemulatio*", and Conte's "integrative allusion"; Thomas's "correction" is Giangrande's "*oppositio in imitando*"; Thomas's "self-reference" is Hinds's "reflexive iteration"; Conte's "reflective allusion" is comparable to Thomas's "self-reference", "apparent reference", and "multiple reference" or "conflation."

[58] Conte (1986), 66.

[59] Conte (1986), 66.

[60] Conte (1986), 60-62. See also Hinds (1998), 3-5 who re-examines these passages, though instead of the Contean term "reflective allusion" he employs "reflexive annotation."

ried her after Theseus had left her, Ariadne tells of how her divine rescuer has forsaken her (*Fasti* 3.469-475):

> Flebat amans coniunx, spatiataque litore curvo
> edidit incultis talia verba comis:
> "En iterum, fluctus, similes audite querellas!
> En iterum lacrimas accipe, harena, meas!
> Dicebam, memini, 'Periure et perfide Theseu!'
> ille abiit, eadem crimina Bacchus habet.
> Nunc quoque 'Nulla viro' – clamabo – 'femina credat.'"
>
> The loving wife wept, and wandering along the curved
> beach with her hair dishevelled, proclaimed, "You, waves,
> of the sea listen to the same lamentations again! You, sands,
> receive my tears once more! I remember that I used to say
> 'Theseus, breaker of promises and traitor!' He left me.
> Bacchus commits the same crimes now. Now too I will shout, 'Let
> no woman believe a man.'"

These lines are clearly an allusion to Catullus's *c.* 64.130-135 and 143-144:

> Atque haec extremis maestam dixisse querellis,
> frigidulos udo singultus ore cientem:
> "Sicine me patriis avectam, perfide, ab aris,
> perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu?
> Sicine discedens neglecto numine divum
> immemor, a! devota domum periuria portas?"
> ……………………………………………
> "nunc iam nulla viro iuranti femina credat,
> nulla viri speret sermones esse fideles."
>
> At the end of her lamentations miserably she said,
> uttering her shivering sobs from a tear-stained face,
> "Traitor, after taking me from my paternal altars, traitor Theseus,
> have you left me thus on a deserted beach?
> Is it thus, leaving, disregarding the divine will of the gods,
> forgetful man, go! that you thus carry your cursed treachery home?"
> ……………………………………………
> "now let no woman believe a man when he swears, let
> no woman hope that a man's words are true!"

Ovid's verses create an Ariadne who appears to have lived her Catullan poetic experience, and now remembers her emotions from that context. While Ovid's verses clearly refer to Catullus', Ovid gives the reader clear textual hints that separate his from his predecessor's verses. *Memini* ("I remember") delineates the past from the present, while

dicebam ("I used to say"), *iterum* ("again"), and *nunc quoque* ("now also") emphasize this. The two poetic texts resemble one another, but they do not (and can not) merge to produce one "new" text. Furthermore, Ovid plays with the notion of reality in this allusion with the effect that the reader questions which is "real": the Ariadne that lives within the poetry, or the literary reality in which poets manipulate a character. As this example illustrates, this type of allusion most often unmasks the artifice and fiction that underlie artistic creation.

Conte's theory cannot be adopted entirely without modification. The underpinning of Conte's theory regarding allusion owes something to the concept of the "intentional fallacy" conceived by Wimsatt and Beardsley.[61] Writing more than half a century ago, their main point is that one cannot recover an author's intention, and that it is fruitless to fault the poet for not achieving the goals set for him by the critic. Though this concept and its collateral, that meaning is created at the point of reception, might seem commonsensical, others have taken this approach to an extreme. They believe that the author's own conception of his work is one of many and should not be privileged and that the author's role in literary composition is insignificant beside the influence of overwhelming structural forces such as genre, meter and its tradition, and form. Though Conte does not subscribe to this school of thought and tries to maintain an equilibrium between meaningful textual analysis and avoidance of intentional fallacy, he occasionally comes near to embracing what he seeks to avoid. This is understandable given that every reader will try to make sense of a text by considering what the author may have intended. The problem confronting anyone who wishes to discuss allusion is apparent in Conte's more general discussion following that of Catullus's and Virgil's allusion to Homer's *Odyssey*:

> Catullus alludes to Homer simply to make Odysseus's mythical journey well up through his words. He certainly has no intention of competing with Homer........With Virgil the situation is different. We have already seen how many different threads have been woven into his lines. Homer's words and Catullus's are intertwined there, but their functions differ. Virgil admires Catullus as a man of letters and wishes to show that he has grasped the intention of his allusion. Virgil's motive in using Catullus's line and in deciphering its relation

[61] Wimsatt and Beardsley (1946).

> to Homer is not emulation but a desire to pay tribute to the methods of a poetic he values and wishes to be identified with.[62]

Because Conte's approach to literary allusion has been adopted for this study, these problems of authorial intention, as well as terminology employed in this study, which is closely linked to the issue of authorial intention, must be addressed.

Recently Hinds, a proponent of Conte's methods, has confronted this issue. He embraces a middle course by rejecting both the fundamentalist view that reconstructs authorial intention as well as the reader-reception view that banishes the author entirely. While Hinds maintains that authorial intention cannot be invoked to validate allusions, he also admits that simply because an author's intention may be ultimately impossible to recover, and certainly difficult to measure, it does not mean that authorial intention and the reader's desire to call it forth do not exist.[63] More recent modifications of Conte's theory, put forward by Eco and Conte himself, show that some interest in authorial intention can be allowed into discussions.[64] These alterations accept that any reader derives meaning from a poetic text by trying to construct a poet's intention. Of course, this construction may be erroneous or misconceived, but the reconstructed author is the one who writes for the reconstructing reader. In this way they join the theories of authorial intention and reader reception. While this construction is theoretically impossible to counter, in the reality of a written examination their "textual intentions" and "model readers" (in place of authorial intention and usual readers) may never be adequate tools for the critics who seek sharply or definitively to account for all allusive types.

Therefore, this study will use Conte's approach as its foundations, and specifically his categorization of all allusions into two primary types (integrative and reflective), with the goal that discussions will be focused on textual relationships and their effects. As discussed above, there will be one modification to Conte's model. This study will strive to focus on texts, but because any reader creates his own author, we must accept that readers will construct meaning, and thus the distinction between textual and authorial intention cannot always be definite.

---

[62] Conte (1986), 36-37.

[63] See Hinds (1998), 47-51 as well as the entirety of his book, which offers discussions negotiating terminology with which to examine allusion, as well as fine discussions of the parameters of how the reader perceives allusion.

[64] Eco (1990), and (1992), as well as Conte (1994).

Finally, we must turn to the issue of terminology employed in this study. There exists something of a war in modern scholarship between those who study "allusion" and those who discuss "intertextuality." "Allusion" is sometimes used by what some call "philological fundamentalists" who seek to sharply, definitively define the differences between "allusion" or "reference" and "accidental confluence".[65] "Allusion" appears to be seen by some as suggestive of an author bearing an intention. The term "intertextuality", which some see as the antithesis of an "allusion", suggests an approach to the relationship between texts, a rejection of the notion that an author's intentions can be retrieved, and an acceptance of the idea that only the reader's reception of a text matters. The term "intertextuality" was first coined by the Tel Quel group and is now most usually associated with the literary criticism of Kristeva.[66] Kristeva herself has argued that every text at every point in time must draw upon other texts, because any given text is a collection of other, earlier texts. This view of textual relationships is too broad for this study, which seeks to examine only one aspect of intertextuality. Some classical philologists have adopted this term and, in an attempt to circumscribe its boundaries, redefined it as "poetic memory".[67] However, because of a general deficiency in terminology even these scholars use the term "allusion" in their studies. More recently Hinds (1998), has discussed the problems surrounding the ideologies that have come to be associated with each term and, in an attempt to expand the boundaries of what we consider "allusion", uses all in his own examinations of allusivity. This study will use the terms "allusion", "allusive technique", and "reference" to describe the creative use of other texts, usually earlier, which enhance the reader's understanding of the text being read.

Organization of the Study

This study cannot hope to be a systematic analysis of every, or even most, allusions contained within Callimachus' extant poetry and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This can be only a suggestive analysis, which will point out the allusive techniques of both a Greek and a Latin poet at

[65] Thomas (1986), 172, n. 8 prefers the term "reference" to "allusion".
[66] Kristeva (1974) and (1980) as well as Derrida (1973).
[67] See Conte (1986) and Segre (1982).

particular points in their texts. The following pages are an attempt to apply Conte‘s typology of allusion to both a Greek and Latin poet, giving each poet and his language equal consideration. Passages from Callimachus' and Ovid's works have been selected if they display a clear relationship to each other; some passages have been dealt with extensively by others, some have been mentioned in passing in commentaries as being related, and still others have been examined extensively by others who have reached quite different conclusions.

The investigation of Callimachus' and Ovid's referential techniques begins within the narrow focus of the prologues of the *Aetia* and *Metamorphoses.* Within the confines of these few verses, in which ancient poets routinely reveal their poems's subject matter, genre, and place within literary tradition, the reader also finds programmatic terminology that constitutes highly compressed lexical allusions. These allusions convey important clues to the author's poetic technique and ideals for the poems in general, and, more specifically, the predominant type of allusion the reader may find in the *Aetia* and *Metamorphoses*.

The focus of the next chapter widens to include an examination of multiple lexically-based references within two treatments of the tales of Tiresias and Actaeon, which are found in portions of Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Book 3. We find that within their versions of Tiresias' and Actaeon's fates both poets employed "sign-posting" to signal particular passages as allusive, and that we may extend the definition of allusion beyond the lexical to include the manners in which poets manipulate the arrangement of traditional stories and components of stories within their own texts.

The scope of the fourth chapter is broader still in the quantity of texts examined, and it continues to push the boundaries of the definition of allusion. This chapter concentrates on substantial portions of Callimachus' *Hymn* 6 and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Book 6, in which both poets employ textual marking of yet another sort within their nexus of tales concerning Asteria/Delos, Leto, and Niobe; their sign-posts do not simply indicate referential passages, they are allusions themselves. It is also revealed that neither poet confines himself to lexically-based references only and both freely alternate allusive types within a series of connected tales.

Within the framework of Callimachus' *Hymn* 6 and Ovid's *Met.* 8.738-878, and the poets' renditions of the tale of Erysichthon, the focus of the final chapter is upon the relationship of allusion and genre.

more specifically on the question how both Callimachus and Ovid employ different types of allusion to verify their poems as belonging to a particular genre while then referring to yet another genre. This particular allusive technique not only uncovers the artifice of poetic creation, but also problematizes the reader's conception of genre.

CHAPTER TWO

A WELL-DEFINED SCOPE: LEXICAL INTEGRATIVE AND REFLECTIVE ALLUSIONS IN THE PROLOGUE OF CALLIMACHUS' *AETIA* AND THE PROEM OF OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*

δεῖγμά ἐστι τοῦ λόγου, ἵνα προειδῶσι
περὶ οὗ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ μὴ κρέμηται ἡ διάνοια

[the proem] provides a sample of the subject,
in order that the hearers may know beforehand
what it is about, and so that the meaning is not
kept in suspense.
(Aristotle *Rhetoric* 3.1415a12f.)

Introduction: Proems and Prologues

The opening verses of poems written in antiquity contain complex nexuses of meaning. Here the Hellenistic and Roman poets placed carefully selected words in order to send their audience important signals about the subject matter of their text, writing style, the poems' places within literary tradition, and ultimately their poetic techniques. Here is where a poet frequently inserted allusions, allusions that often are comprised of only a few programmatic words. If these allusions are understood fully, they convey important information about the poem and the poetic technique of its maker.[1]

In Greek poetry composed up to the fourth century B.C. one of the chief functions of proems was to indicate a poem's essential content, that is, to inform the public of the song's object, its *quid*.[2] There is perhaps no better example of such an expository proem than those of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. These prologues clearly lay out the outline of the story that will be told and, as they are recited, the verses reveal

[1] Conte (1986), 76, 82.
[2] Conte (1992), 147-149.

that they were hexametric poems. Thus, they signal the genre of the poems: heroic epic. When we look more closely at the proem of a post-Hellenistic epic, that of Virgil's *Aeneid*, we see that this proem indicates more than simply the *quid* of the poem. In these opening verses Virgil places before his reader the main thrust of his poem—the predestined establishment of Rome by Aeneas, after he has endured many difficulties—just as his predecessor did. What distinguishes this first century B.C. proem from the Homeric proems is that Virgil weaves into his prologue a clear indication of its individual artistic character, the *quale* of his poem. By the end of the second hexametric verse the reader understands that this is not simply a heroic epic, but that the *Aeneid* is to be a Roman continuation of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as the words *arma* ("arms"; *Iliad*) and *virum* ("man"; *Odyssey*) suggest[3], while the distinctly Roman element of the poem follows with the words *fato profugus*, *dum conderet urbem* ("an exile by fate"; "until he founded the city"). The movement of the entire poem, from Troy to Rome, is anticipated with the long relative clause beginning with *Troiae* and ending with *Romae*, and the religious nature of Rome's foundation is defined by the phrases *dum conderet urbem* ("until he founded the city") and *inferretque deos Latio* ("and introduced his gods to Latium") . This type of proem is programmatic; in it Virgil signals to the reader the *quid* of his poem ("a heroic epic poem") and the *quale* ("a combination of both Homeric epics with an emphasis on the foundation of Rome").

This type of programmatic proem was a product of the Hellenistic age, a product of a different cultural system in which the poet no longer addressed himself to the general public, of which he too was a part, but to a group of connoisseurs.[4] With this new type of reader and new approach to literature in mind, the poet devised a new type of proem, so the reader not only understood the *quid* of the poem, but also and above all else, its *quale*, the artistic approach of the poem.

This study of Callimachean and Ovidian poetic allusions begins with a re-examination of the prologues of the *Aetia* and the *Metamorphoses* and the allusions both poets inserted to signal to their readers the artistic character of their poems. There has been little

[3] Williams (1972), 156.

[4] Conte (1992), 148-149. As Annette Harder and André Lardinois have pointed out to me, this prologue type, the "*quale* prologue", may be foreshadowed by the prologue of Hesiod's *Theogony*.

agreement among scholars regarding these proems, other than the fact that both are generically programmatic. However, in light of the importance of the *quale* of prologues in post-fourth century B.C. poetry, it seems unlikely that either poet was only interested in establishing the genre of their poems. What do the allusions of both proems tell the audience about the artistic nature of the poems?

A Brief History of Interpretations

The *Metamorphoses* begins (*Met.* 1.1-4):[5]

> In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas
> corpora: di, coeptis (nam vos mutastis et illa)
> adspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi
> ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen.
>
> My spirit moves me to tell of forms transformed
> into new bodies: gods (since you transformed even
> these things) inspire my beginnings and spin a
> continuous poem from the earliest beginnings
> of the world down to my own times.

Ovid's reference in the proem of the *Metamorphoses* to the *Aetia's* prologue has long been recognized: *deducite* ("spin" or "lead down"; *Met.* 1.4) is an allusion to τὴν Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην ("the slender Muse"; *Aet.* Fr. 1.24) and Ovid's use of this word in his epic's introduction implies that he is adhering to the poetic ideals of Callimachus.[6] The

---

[5] For the choice of *illa* over *illas* see Kenney (1976), 46-50.

[6] In the time leading up to the composition of the *Metamorphoses* the word *deduco* "had acquired a special resonance: in this intensely literary context [the proem] *deducite* plays upon the full range of associations of Augustan poetry, in which the *deductum carmen* represents the τὴν Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην", Knox (1986) 10. The phrase *deductum carmen* specifically recalls Virgil's rendering of Callimachus in *Ecl.* 6.3-5, which will be examined below. For the standard discussions of the programmatic nature of *deduco* see Reitzenstein (1931), 49-51 and Wimmel (1960) passim. The double force of *deducite,* meaning "bring down" and well as "polish" was pointed out independently by Kenney (1976), 51-52; Due (1974), 95; and Gilbert (1976), 111-112. Though this discussion will focus upon the allusions within the boundaries of the introductory portions of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Callimachus' *Aetia*, it should be mentioned that Callimachus employs forms of λεπτός at other *loci*: in Fr. 197.42; Fr. 228.14; and λεπταλέος, Fr. 383.15. The contexts are too fragmentary to determine the precise meaning of the adjective. The fragmentary nature of Fr. 274.1 ἀρμοῖ που κἀκείνῳ ἐπέτρεχε λεπτὸς ἴουλος / ἄνθει ἑλιχρύσῳ ἐναλίγκιος, "a delicate down, like the blossom of the flower of the ivy, was spreading, I think, on his cheeks too" (trans. Trypanis (1958), makes additional meanings of the adjective impossible to determine;

Metamorphoses' introduction, at the same time, however, also indicates that the poem is *not* adhering to Callimachus' poetic ideals, for in using the phrase *perpetuum...carmen* ("continuous song"; *Met.* 1.4), one rendering of Callimachus ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς ("one continuous poem"; *Aet.* Fr. 1.3), the sort of poem that the Hellenistic poet's critics allegedly criticized him for not producing, Ovid seems to suggest that the poem he introduces is of the type which Callimachus disavowed.[7]

Scholars have explained this paradox in various ways. One school of thought believes that Ovid, in using these words, is declaring that unlike Callimachus he has chosen the wider road, that he is breaking Callimachus' injunction against epic poetry (*Aet.* Fr. 1.25-29).[8] Others believe that Ovid uses this particular combination of words to declare that his epic will be both "Callimachean" and "un-Callimachean".[9] Some within this group maintain that the juxtaposition of *perpetuum* and *deducite* ("continuous" and "lead down/spin"), two programmatic words that ostensibly signify different genres of literature, indicates that Ovid will be addressing the issue of genre in his epic.[10]

If one accepts these interpretations one question arises: why would Ovid have made it a point to reject "Callimachean" poetics in the introduction of his epic when there were many previous precedents of "un-Callimachean" poetry, such as, for example, the *Aeneid*? Knox has answered this question. His view of the *Metamorphoses'*s introduction represents the other end of the spectrum with his belief that "in Ovid's *carmen perpetuum* Callimachus would have recognized a poem very much like his own" and that, therefore, the juxtaposition of *perpetuum* and *deducite* does not represent a statement about poetic genres, but

---

the adjective at *Hymn* 3.243 ὑπήεισαν δὲ λίγειαι / λεπταλέον σύριγγες, ἵνα ῥήσσωσιν ὁμαρτῇ·, "and the loud pipes piped shrill accompaniment, that they might foot the dance together" (trans. Mair (1960), is reminiscent of that in both Aeschylus and Sophocles; see p. 43, footnote 58.

[7] See, e.g., Bömer (1957), 14-15 and Pfeiffer (1953) on Fr. 1.4.

[8] Otis (1970), 45-46; Galinsky (1975), *passim;* Herter (1948), 129-145 (= von Albrecht and Zinn (1968, 351-8); Wimmel (1960), 76 n.1; 331 n. 1. Though it is impossible to recover precisely how pre-Augustan and Augustan poets interpreted this phrase, the Callimachean "ban" on epic poetry may have been an invention of the Augustan poets, an adaptation of Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue altered for the special needs of their own time; see Reitzenstein (1931), 59-61 and Cameron (1995), 454-483.

[9] Kenney (1982), 138-39 and Kenney (1976), 46-50.

[10] Hinds develops Heinze's belief in generic differences evident in Ovid's *Met.* and *Fasti* and reinforces the importance of generic epic norms; Hinds (1987), *passim*; Heinze (1919) *passim*; and Myers (1994), 3-5. See also Kroll (1924) for his landmark "*Kreuzung*".

that Ovid has used these terms so that it might be impossible to categorize his epic generically.[11]

Just as the meaning of the *Metamorphoses'* proem has been much disputed, so too has been that of the prologue of the *Aetia* (*Aet.* Fr. 1.1-40). In this introduction Callimachus sets forth his programmatic declaration in a series of contrasts: one continuous poem versus a short tale (Fr.1.3-5);[12] the short versus the long poems of Mimnermus and Philetas (Fr. 1.10-12);[13] short versus long poems in general (Fr.1.13-18);[14] fat versus slender (Fr. 1.23-24);[15] the well-worn path versus narrow, unworn ones (Fr. 1.25-29);[16] the clear voice of the

---

[11] Knox (1986), 9-10.

[12] Fr.1.3-5:
εἵνεκεν οὐκ ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές ἢ βασιλη
......]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσα χιλιάσιν
ἢ.....].ους ἥρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἑλ[ίσσω;
"Because I did not accomplish one continuous poem about… kings…..or heroes in many thousands of lines, but I roll out a short tale".

[13] Fr. 1.10-12:
....πολὺ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρο[ς·
τοῖν δὲ] δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν
......] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή.
"But bountiful Demeter outweighs by far the
long…and of the two poems the slender
one…and not the Large Woman taught that
Mimnermus is a delightful poet."

[14] Fr.1.13-18:
.....]ον ἐπὶ Θρήϊκας ἀπ' Αἰγύπτοιο [πέτοιτο
αἵματ]ι Πυγμαίων ἡδομένη [γ]έρα[νος,
Μασσαγέται καὶ μακρὸν ὀϊστεύοιεν ἐπ' ἄνδρα
Μῆδον]· ἀ[ηδονίδες] δ' ὧδε μελιχρ[ό]τεραι.
ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος· αὖθι δὲ τέχνῃ
κρίνετε,] μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην·
"Let the crane, delighting in the blood of the Pygmies, fly (far) from Eygpt to the land of the Thracians and let the Massagetae shoot their arrows at the Medes from a great distance; but poems are sweeter for being short. Be gone, you baneful race of malice! Hereafter judge poetry by (the canons) of art, and not by the Persian chain."

[15] Fr. 1.23-24:
"*.......]...ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον*
θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·»
"Poet, feed the sacrificial victim to be as fat as possible but keep the Muse slender, my friend."

[16] Fr. 1.25-29;
"*πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἅμαξαι*
τὰ στείβειν, ἑτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμά
δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ'οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις."
τῷ πιθόμη]ν·»

cicada versus the braying of asses (Fr.1.29-34).[17] In short, the poet has constructed a series of "little-refined" versus "big-crude" contrasts, around which he has woven the motif of the favor of the Muses.[18] Scholars have readily understood much of Callimachus' programmatic language. The words *λεπτόν* ("slender" or "small-scale"; *Aet.* Fr. 1.11) and *τὴ]ν* Μ*οῦσαν....λεπταλέην* ("the slender Muse"; *Aet.* Fr. 1.24) seem to cause little concern among scholars and most have translated and interpreted the words in the same manner. The former is usually rendered "small-scale", which ostensibly refers to poetry, and the latter "the slender Muse", which is most definitely a reference to poetry. This heavily loaded adjective will be examined in due course. The primary interpretational problem appears to lie in the phrase *ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές*. These three words have been the crux of many scholarly disputes. What does the poet mean when he characterizes his critics as grumbling because he has not composed "*ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές ἢ βασιλ[η /]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσα χιλιάσιν / ἢ..].ους ἥρωας*" ("one continuous poem about… kings… or heroes in many thousands of lines"; *Aetia* verses 3-5)? The modifier *διηνεκές* seems to carry more meaning than simply "continuous," as it is usually translated.

A scholium on the *Iliad* uses *διηνεκές* as a grammatical term to describe words that influence the accent of the following word, but not as a term to describe or discuss poetry.[19] How, then, have scholars under-

---

"This I advise too: tread a path which carriages do not trample; do not drive your chariot upon the common tracks of others, nor along a wide road, but on unworn paths, though your course be more narrow."

[17] Fr.1.29-34:

ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ ἀείδομεν οἳ λιγὺν ἦχον
τέττιγος, θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων.
θηρὶ μὲν οὐατόεντι πανείκελον ὀγκήσαιτο
ἄλλος, ἐγ]ὼ δ' εἴην οὑλ[α]χύς, ὁ πτερόεις,
ἆ πὰντως, ἵνα γῆρας ἵνα δρόσον ἣν μὲν ἀείδω
πρώκιον ἐκ δίης ἠέρος εἶδαρ ἔδων

"'For we sing among those who love the clear sound of the cicada and not the noise of the asses.' Let the others bray just like the long-eared beast, but let me be the dainty, winged one. Yes indeed, that I, as an old man, may sing consuming dew-drops, free sustenance from the divine air."

[18] Cameron (1995), 130. While this chapter focuses upon the lexical references that connect the prologues of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Callimachus' *Aetia*, Harder (1993), 99-103 has demonstrated that the recurrence of particular personages in the *Aetia* suggests a more complex view of Callimachus' programmatic statement. For a view of Callimachus' programmatic use of the Muses see Harder (1988), 1-14. See Harder (1987), 21-30, for a view of programmatic vocabulary in two recently published *Aetia* fragments, SH 239 and 253.

[19] Erbse (1983), index, 311; Cameron (1995), 341.

stood this word? Most maintain that the phrase "continuous poem" means "narrative" or "epic", and so Wilamowitz, and later Pohlenz, believed that any long poem would be a continuous narrative or epic.[20] However, not all epic poems are continuous narratives, especially the two most highly regarded ones in antiquity, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

Other scholars argue that the Telchines grumble because Callimachus had not composed a "long, *uninterrupted*, epic poem" of many thousands of lines.[21] According to Brink, whose interpretation rests less upon the force of διηνεκές and more upon that of ἕν, Callimachus employs ἕν to represent the unity that Aristotle admired in Homer's poems, and so the poet, judging by his proem, rejected the traditional concept of unity and imitation of Homer, whose poems Aristotle used as exemplars of perfect poetic unity.[22] Pfeiffer follows suit, stating that Callimachus and his school were anti-Aristotelian; that "rejecting unity, completeness, and magnitude," Callimachus and his followers "consciously aimed at a discontinuous form".[23] Though unity is central to modern literature, Heath questions the importance of unity in ancient literary works and asks whether our modern concept matches that of ancient writers.[24] Though we may not agree with Heath's conclusions, the doubts he raises in conjunction with the fact that there is no single ancient term for the modern concept of unity, and the fact that Aristotle's "single plot" and "one action" are not the sort of unity to which modern critics refer, make Brink's and Pfeiffer's conclusions that Callimachus and his school were anti-Aristotelian less convincing. Furthermore, Cameron suggests that ἕν should "not be read as anything so simple and drastic as a rejection of unity in the modern sense," and that "ἕν takes its colour and emphasis from διηνεκές".[25]

Heath has put forward the idea that Callimachus presented the *Aetia* itself as a response to his critics. "Single and continuous" means "formally connected", not "possessing unified subject matter", and is thus a description of the *Aetia*.[26] The primary difficulty with this interpreta-

---

[20] Wilamowitz (1924) I.184; Pohlenz (1933), 320 n.2; Cameron (1995), 342.

[21] Cameron (1995), 342 and Pfeiffer (1968), 137.

[22] Cameron (1995), 342.

[23] Pfeiffer (1968), 137. See also Lyne (1984), 18 who believes that "Callimachus is admitting that he neglects what most ancient critics, certainly Aristotle, would deem a cardinal virtue: unity of plot, continuity of narrative technique."

[24] Heath (1989). For less radical views see Schenkeveld (1992), 1-8 and Ford (1991), 125-154.

[25] Cameron (1995), 343-344.

[26] Heath (1989), 56.

tion, however, is that separation of 'one continuous poem' from 'many thousands of lines' too greatly strains the meaning of this passage. How can we interpret ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές in this way when it is so clearly syntactically connected to "many thousands of lines", and is set in opposition to the rest of the prologue in which Callimachus purports to answer his critics?

A fourth interpretation of the prologue in general, and ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές in particular, is represented by Adam and Cameron.[27] Adam argued that διηνεκές must be a term used to describe a continuous, linear narrative, a poem written in the style of a chronicle in which events are reported chronologically without an over-riding structure or climax. As Cameron has pointed out, the "Callimachean" idiom for this type of poetry is "cyclic" and ἕν, he argues, refers not to unity, but to uniformity.[28] Therefore this particular adjective refers not to the length of a poem, but to its poetic style.[29]

It is clear that there is no consensus among scholars concerning the precise meaning of the Callimachean ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές or the Ovidian *perpetuum deducite carmen*, other than that the latter is an allusion to the former, and that both poets used these words in their proems because they relayed important information to the readers about their poems. This chapter will endeavor to clarify the poets' messages first by showing that Callimachus' programmatic vocabulary constitutes allusions that, if understood by the reader, contain vital information about the style, not the genre, of the *Aetia*. As we shall see, Ovid, in turn, appropriates this vocabulary and reactivates it for purposes similar to Callimachus', i.e. to send an important message in his proem about poetic style. Finally, this chapter will discuss the type of allusions Callimachus and Ovid have constructed and employed, and how this allusive type gives the reader vital information about how to approach their *Aetia* and *Metamorphoses*.

Διηνεκές

If we accept the definition offered by most lexicons of the adjective διηνεκές, which points to the word's composition from δια and the root

[27] Adam (1889), 74; Cameron (1995), 339-361.
[28] Cameron (1995), 343-345.
[29] Cameron (1995), 339-345.

ἐνεκ-, which is derived from ἐνεγκεῖν (the secondary aorist infinitive of φέρω – "carry"),[30] we would probably conclude that Callimachus' ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς must mean one "long" or "continous" poem, especially given that this phrase clearly contrasts with ἔπος...τυτθὸν ("short tale"; Fr. 1.5). A closer examination of the contexts of the adjectival forms of διηνεκές appearing in poetry from the time of Homer up to and including Apollonius Rhodius, suggests that in addition to one of its lexical meanings, the word possesses a somewhat lofty and sometimes heroic connotation. The adjective appears in two formulaic passages describing the larger portions of sacrificial meat allotted to Ajax (*Il.* 7.321) and Odysseus (*Od.* 14.437), once more in the *Iliad* to describe the golden rivets around Sarpedon's shield (*Il.* 12.297), and three times in the *Odyssey* to modify the roots of a tree (*Od.* 12.134), roads (*Od.* 13.195), and a furrow in a field (*Od.* 18.375). In Hesiod's *Theogony*, in a simile reminiscent of *Od.* 12.134, the poet uses the adjective in likening the roots of tree to a bronze threshold (812), in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* it appears twice to depict the "far-reaching foundations" the god lays down (255, 295). Much later, and in keeping with one of his compositional habits, Apollonius of Rhodes adopts the adjective, suggestive of a Homeric occurrence, to describe a landscape that stretches out continuously before the crew of the Argo (*Argo.* 4.1247).[31]

If, Callimachus chose διηνεκές to depict what his critics blamed him for not producing, then ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς may be translated "a continous poem" or "a long poem." This translation duplicates that of many scholars and brings us no closer to understanding what this phrase means, particularly when we recall that ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς is followed by ἐν πολλαῖς...χιλιάσιν; this phrase would seem to adequately describe the type of ἄεισμα the critics criticized Callimachus for not writing. To these traditional translations then we may add the undertone of "heroic" or "lofty" that is lent by the passages, discussed above, in which διηνεκές occurs. The adjective would also give the decipherable word βασιλ[η an additional dimension. While this enhances the reader's understanding of the adjective, this modifier possesses another connotation that a poet of Callimachus'

---

[30] Chantraine (1968), 282.

[31] It is interesting to note that Apollonius uses the adjective in such a way that it may remind the reader of the Homeric use of the modifier to describe Odysseus facing his unrecognisable homeland after many years of absence (*Od.* 13.194-6).

caliber would have been aware of and would have wanted his reader to draw upon while reading the prologue.

The adverbial forms of the adjective, *διηνεκέως* and *διηνεκῶς*, appear several times in the context of story-telling in poetry pre-dating and contemporaneous with Callimachus, each time accompanied by a verb of speaking and signifying "fully," "uninterrupted" or "continuous". Richard Martin, who defines *μῦθος* in Homer as "a speech-act indicating authority, performed at length, usually in public, with a focus on full attention to every detail," demonstrates that there is good formulaic authority for the association of *μῦθος* and *ἀγορεύειν*, which is usually defined "to speak in public".[32] Homeric speech-acts are begun in an assembly, *μύθων ἦρχε* ("he began a speech"; *Il.* 2.433; *Il.* 5.420), or simply begun, *ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν* ("he began to speak"; *Il.* 1.571; *Il.* 7.347). In the *Odyssey* phrases using both words function as formulaic complements. For example, *ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν* at the end of a verse (*Od.* 2.15; *Od.*16.345) is interchangeable with *ἄρχετο μύθων* (*Od.* 1.367; *Od.* 15.166).[33] This would suggest that the verb *ἀγορεύειν* implies a public audience, and with the addition of the adverb *διηνεκέως*, it would mean speaking with full attention to detail.

In the *Odyssey* the adverbial form of *διηνεκές* together with forms of *ἀγορεύειν* are used on three occasions: 4.836, 7.241, and 12.56. At 4.836, Athena, concerned about the welfare of Penelope, sends a phantom of her sister, Iphthime, to comfort her. After reassuring her sister about the fate of Telemachus, the phantom refuses to answer Penelope's questions about Odysseus and says (*Od.* 4.836-837):

> *Οὐ μέν τοι κεῖνόν γε διηνεκέως ἀγορεύσω,*
> *ζώει ὅ γ' ἦ τέθνηκε· Κακὸν δ' ἀνεμώλια βάζειν.*
>
> As for that other one, I will not tell you in detail
> whether he lives or has died. It is bad to talk
> words of the wind.

We note here that though Penelope may desire a full account of her missing husband, the phantom emphasizes the undesirability of telling everything at this point in the narrative. While visiting the Phaeacians, the master story-teller himself, Odysseus, replies to Queen Arete's request for him to tell them about his adventures (*Od.* 7.241-242):

[32] Martin (1989), 12.
[33] Martin (1989), 37.

ἀργαλέον, βασίλεια, διηνεκέως ἀγορεῦσαι
κήδε', ἐπεὶ μοι πολλὰ δόσαν θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες.

It is a difficult thing, Queen, to tell you all
my troubles in detail, since the gods of
the sky have given me many.

The third occurrence also involves an explanation. Circe, instructing Odysseus before he sets out from her island says (*Od.* 12.55-58):

Αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ τάς γε παρὲξ ἐλάσωσιν ἑταῖροι,
ἔνθα τοι οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα διηνεκέως ἀγορεύσω
ὁπποτέρῃ δή τοι ὁδὸς ἔσσεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς
θυμῷ βουλεύειν·

Then, for the time when your companions have
driven past, for that time I will no longer
tell you in detail which way of the two your course
lies, but you yourself must consider this in your
own mind.

In these three Homeric instances the listeners would like a great deal of information, while the speakers are unwilling to tell a narrative from beginning to end.[34] After Homer the adverb appears at *Theogony* 627, at which point Hesiod's Gaia recounts all things to the gods: *αὐτὴ γάρ σφιν ἅπαντα διηνεκέως κατέλεξε* ("for she herself recounted all things fully to the gods"). Here in the context of the *Theogony* both the audiences (divine and human) would like to hear a full account. Later in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* (319), when the chorus of the tragedy asks Clytemnestra to tell them more about the Greeks's victory at Troy (*A.* 318-319):

λόγους δ' ἀκοῦσαι τούσδε κἀποθαυμάσαι
διηνεκῶς θέλοιμ' ἄν, ὡς λέγοις, πάλιν.

But I want to wonder much and to hear the
report in detail; thus tell us your news again.

Once we reach this passage it seems that since the Homeric epics the connotation of the adverbial usage has undergone a change. Within the Homeric contexts the audience (or reader, in our case) is led to believe that an account told "fully" or "from beginning to end" is not desired or

[34] For the adverbial usage of this modifier see Heubeck, West, Hainsworth (1988), 244 who add that this is "a familiar formula….carelessly used"; though this is a formula, one might dispute that it is carelessly used.

deemed possible, by the character/speaker at any rate. Once we reach Hesiod and Aeschylus, however, we see that there are occasions in which to tell a story in this way seems preferable.[35]

Within the *Argonautica* of Callimachus' contemporary we detect a return to the Homeric context and connotation. In fact, all four occurrences of διηνεκέως are allusions to Homer. At 1.649, the poem's narrator, catching himself in a digression, speaks directly to the audience, rejecting the notion of recounting a tale from beginning to end (1.648-649):

> ἀλλὰ τί μύθους
> Αἰθαλίδεω χρείω με διηνεκέως ἀγορεύειν
>
> But why do I want to tell the story of Aethalides
> fully?

Apollonius uses διηνεκέως in describing Jason's report of the invitation Hypsipyle extends to the Argonauts. Notice that while Jason tells his tale from beginning to end, the poet does not (1.847-848):

> μῦθον ὅτ' ἤδη πάντα διηνεκέως ἀγόρευσεν,
> τόν ῥα καλεσσαμένη διεπέφραδεν Ὑψιπύλεια...
>
> and when he had reported fully the entire speech
> that Hypsipyle had plainly told when she had summoned him...

At *Argo*. 3.401, in King Aeetes' replies to Jason's request for the golden fleece: Ξεῖνε, τί κεν τὰ ἕκαστα διηνεκέως ἀγορεύοις ("Guest, why should you tell everything from beginning to end?"). The reader immediately recognizes the Homeric formula Apollonius uses in these passages.[36] The poet has not only borrowed these Homeric phrases, but alludes to its connotation in the Homeric contexts as well.[37] Just as in the *Odyssey*, Apollonius uses διηνεκέως to stress the uninterrupted nature of a narrative: the narrator speaking at length about a tale only loosely connected to the one he tells; Jason using the power of words to persuade his men to accept Hypsipyle's hospitality; King Aeetes's im-

---

[35] Though the chorus requests it, Clytemnestra does *not* give them a complete account of the Trojan war or the fall of the city. It seems that Aeschylus' characters, like Homer's, did not find complete narratives to his purpose.

[36] Many have studied Apollonius' many allusions to Homer; e.g. Hunter (1993) and Campbell (1981).

[37] Newman (1974), 355.

patient response to Jason's request.[38] Using another form of this modifier, Apollonius characterizes Phineus, the prophet, who warns the Argonauts of the dangers that lie ahead much as Homer characterizes Circe in the *Odyssey*. Notice that the formulaic line has been altered, whereas the basic meaning of Homer's *διηνεκέως ἀγορεύειν* is evident and that the character of Phineus believes it a *sin* to tell his prophecy fully (*Argo*. 2.390-391):

> *ἀλλὰ τίη με πάλιν χρειὼ ἀλιτέσθαι*
> *μαντοσύνῃ τὰ ἕκαστα διηνεκὲς ἐξενέποντα.*
>
> But why do I need to sin again by telling you in detail
> all with my gift of divination?

The use of forms of *διηνεκὲς* in the extant poetry prior to and contemporaneous with Callimachus demonstrates that the poet most likely uses the adjective to denote more than simply a "long" or "continuous" poem. The poet may also be drawing upon the connotation of "lofty" or "heroic" inherent in contexts of the adjectival use of his predecessors with perhaps the idea to give more dimension to the following *βασιλ[η*. More importantly, however, it is likely that Callimachus draws upon the associations of the adverbial usage. As we have just seen in Homer, *διηνεκέως* modifying a verb of speaking means to speak publicly "with full attention to detail," something that characters at given points in that poem avoid doing. In Hesiod and Aeschylus, however, we see that in these instances at least both speaker and listener are eager to tell and hear an extensive record of events. Once we reach Apollonius' *Argonautica* we see that the poet revived the Homeric adverbial usage and its associations as well.

How does this information help us interpret *ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς*? Does *ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές*, "single" and "continuous" mean, as Heath has suggested, "formally connected," and is this phrase therefore a description of the *Aetia*? As stated earlier it is doubtful that *ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς* should or can be separated from the rest of the sentence, especially "many thousands of lines" which has undoubtedly negative connotations. Furthermore, none of Callimachus' predecessors use the modifier to mean what Heath has suggested. *Διηνεκές* does not mean, as Wilamowitz and Pohlenz proposed, "narrative", which offers the noun *ἄεισμα* little additional meaning. Nor is it synonymous with "epic," for

[38] For the adverbial usage of this word see commentary of the *Odyssey* edited by Heubeck, West, Hainsworth (1988), 244.

not all epics are continuous, in the sense of recording events from beginning to end, certainly not the two most highly regarded in antiquity. More importantly, nowhere in the examined passages does a poet use διηνεκές to mean "epic".

It seems most likely that this phrase has a meaning similar to the one proposed by Adam and Cameron: a detailed, linear narrative, a poem written in a chronicle style in which events are reported chronologically without an over-riding theme or structure. In the texts examined above this interpretation fits every passage. Thus Odysseus, the master storyteller, would not bore his Phaeacian audience with a full chronological account of his adventures,[39] nor does Circe feel she has the time to explain all of Odysseus's future trials fully; she simply warns him of the most difficult obstacles. Hesiod's Gaia, on the other hand, does wish to tell the entire tale, just as the chorus of Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* asks Clytemnestra to relate her husband's message in full. Reviving the connotation of διηνεκές coupled with a verb of speaking in Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes in the *Argonautica* uses this word to characterize the narrator as catching himself in a digression, in describing Jason's report of a dubious invitation from Hypsipyle, in King Aeetes' heated, impatient reply to Jason, and in depicting Phineus, who like Circe, warns the Argonauts of the danger they will face.

If in using διηνεκές Callimachus not only refers to the common lexical meaning of the adjective, but also hopes the reader will recognize an allusion to Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, incorporating into this adjective the "Homeric" notion of a story told from beginning to end without interruption, then the phrase ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές refers not to a particular genre, but to a particular style of poetry. It is the style that, according to the poet's report of his critics' opinion, the poet himself rejected.[40] The Telchines seem to have preferred a more fulsome style of poetry, while Callimachus found the style of Mimnermus' and Philetas' shorter poems preferable (*Aetia* 1.10-12).[41]

The other association of διηνεκές seen in the texts examined, namely the adjectival form which calls to mind heroic or lofty poetry, finds a

---

[39] Though to his Phaeacian hosts Odysseus does seem to relate his adventures in the order in which they occurred

[40] Cameron (1995), 341-345.

[41] Pfeiffer's reading of the *Scholia Florentina* is that "the shorter poems of Philetas and Mimnermus are compared to their longer compositions and judged superior." Cameron reasons that Mimnermus and Philetas were elegists, therefore, at this point in the prologue Callimachus is discussing different styles of elegy written by both, not different genres of poetry. See Cameron (1995), 308ff.

place in the *Aetia* prologue as well. If we accept that Callimachus has characterized the Telchines as grumbling because he had not written a detailed linear narrative, the additional messages imparted by the use of διηνεκές fit the context quite well. Callimachus would not only avoid composing a poem "fully", judging from his extant poetry he would especially avoid writing an obviously heroic, detailed, linear narrative that seemed to have found some popularity in the Hellenistic age.[42]

If we consider Callimachus' ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές as either a reflective or integrative allusion one aspect of his poetic technique in the *Aetia* prologue is revealed. The "old" Homeric adjective διηνεκές is absorbed into Callimachus' "new" text and a new, single word is created. Perhaps it is because this word is so well integrated into the prologue the simple lexical definition has been adopted. But if the reader can separate the "old" from the "new," he will detect a text laden with meaning. That is to say, Callimachus' appropriation of this Homeric word encompasses the Homeric meaning and the context, and the full meaning of the phrase unfolds once the allusion is detected. Thus, this allusion is integrative; the Callimachean and the Homeric voices dovetail. With the adjective διηνεκές the poet recalls all the Homeric characters and situations for whom and in which a tale told from beginning to end was undesirable. Once Callimachus links this word and its history to his own ἓν ἄεισμα not only does the reader more fully understand his phrase, he sees how ludicrous Callimachus' critics were to criticize him for not producing what Homer himself sometimes disavowed. Thus Callimachus constructed an allusion rich in resonance and one that reaffirms his own poetic judgment referring to the "father" of poetry.

Before moving to an examination of Ovid's apparent allusion to διηνεκές we should pause to consider the implications of the allusion Callimachus makes in using this adjective for an understanding of genre in connection to the *Aetia* prologue. As discussed earlier, this adjective has long been understood by scholars to refer to the epic genre. If we accept that this reference points to an avoidance not of the epic genre, but to a particular style of poetic composition, i.e. one which tells a tale fully, from beginning to end, then this allusion indicates that it is not genre that is at issue in the prologue.

---

[42] Bulloch (1989), 66-67.

Perpetuum Carmen

The phrase *perpetuum carmen* occurs only once prior to the *Metamorphoses*: in the odes of Horace. An examination of Horace's use of this phrase, specifically its context and its significations, will show that traditional translations of *perpetuum carmen* (a "continuous song" or a "continuous poem") have been rather flat and perhaps even mistaken. A more nuanced meaning not only adds depth to Horace's poem, but given that there is only one extant poem in which this phrase appears, it provides another perspective from which we my consider Ovid's use of this phrase in his proem.

Horace begins *Odes* 1.7.1-7:[43]

> Laudabunt alii claram Rhodon aut Mytilenen
> aut Epheson bimarisve Corinthi
> moenia vel Baccho Thebas vel Apolline Delphos
> insignis aut Thessala Tempe.
> Sunt quibus unum opus est intactae Palladis urbem
> carmine perpetuo celebrare et
> undique decerptam fronti praeponere olivam.

> Let others praise bright Rhodes and Mytilene
> or Ephesus or the walls of twin-bayed
> Corinth or Thebes renowned for Bacchus
> or Delphi for Apollo or Thessaly's Tempe.
> There are those whose one work is to celebrate in incessant
> song the city of virgin Pallas and to wreath
> upon their brows olive sprigs gathered from far and wide.

The precedent of translating Horace's *carmine perpetuo* ("with a continuous song") much as one might Callimachus ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές is old. The commentaries of Acron and Porphyry take *carmine perpetuo* to mean "*aut uno metro aut non aliorum laudibus mixtis*".[44] More recently Nisbet and Hubbard have interpreted this phrase much as Wilamowitz and Pohlenz interpreted the *Aetia*'s ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές, "a

---

[43] The translation is that of West (1997). At 1.6 Horace also alludes to the prologue of the *Aetia*, though this reference is not lexical. See also e.g. Wimmel (1960), for a clearer understanding of how Roman poets, particularly the neoterics and the Augustan poets alluded to Callimachus; though Roman poets devised many ways to allude to Callimachus, because this chapter discusses *lexical* allusions, only occurrences of *perpetuum carmen* will be discussed.

[44] *Acronis et Porphyrionis in Q. Horatium Flaccum*, Hauthal (1859) and Schippers (1966)

carmen perpetuum is a continuous long poem".[45] Shorey and Laing agree and go further: Horace refers to a continuous epic and means this type of poetry to contrast with the "shorter flights of lyric," the genre of the *Odes*.[46] If one follows this tradition, it is logical to interpret and translate Ovid's *perpetuum…carmen* similarly. If, however, the signification of the Callimachean phrase has not been precisely understood, it would seem likely that another consideration of Horace's rendition of his Hellenistic predecessor is in order, and it seems that in this ode Horace offers the reader more information on how to understand his *carmine perpetuo* ("with a 'continuous' poem").

To this discussion some scholars have added that the *unum opus* ("one work") of line 5 is closely associated with *carmine perpetuo* and is a translation of Callimachus' ἕν ("one"); this would seem to secure the ode's relationship to the *Aetia* prologue.[47] West believes that the phrase as a whole is used by Horace to associate these poets with the writers of "long, old-fashioned epics" and with this we are once more where we began with the reconsideration of Callimachus' διηνεκές.[48] Horace does discriminate the type of poetry, however, when discussing verse 7, *undique decerptam fronti praeponere olivam* ("to place on the brow olive gathered from everywhere"); this suggests that these poets' works were derivative and were taken from the whole corpus of Greek poetry.[49] Nisbet and Hubbard assert that Horace here is thinking of the poems, written by many Hellenistic poets, that eulogized countries.[50] Given that Horace lists Greek locations, this would seem more likely than interpreting the writers to be simply "epic poets". If the reader is still uncertain about the type of poetry Horace rejects in this ode, then the poet's addition of an enumeration of Greek cities, verses 8-11, all of which are connected to Iliadic heroes who are given a Latin version of their Greek epithets, seems to indicate that it is not Homer whom the poet rejects, but the imitators of Homer and those writers of encomia of Greek cities. Although this gives a clearer idea of the meaning of Horace's *carmine perpetuo*, it is still unclear whether this refers to a

[45] Nisbet and M. Hubbard (1970).
[46] Shorey and G.J. Laing (1919).
[47] See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 97; Cameron (1995), 345, 464; and West (1997), 33.
[48] West (1997), 33.
[49] West (1997), 33-34.
[50] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 92, who single out Rhianus in particular, though there were undoubtedly more whose poems were "diffuse and anti-Callimachean". See also Ziegler (1966), 19 and Pfeiffer (1968), 144, 148ff.

particular genre of poetry or, like the text of Callimachus, to a certain poetic style.

The structure of Horace's ode gives the reader further clues in determining the precise meaning of *carmine perpetuo*. In capturing disparate subjects, the ode is similar in conception to that of Callimachus' *Aetia*. The first (*Ode* 1.7.1-14) and second (*Ode* 1.7.15-21) portions of the poem are joined by the subject of Tibur, which in turn is finally connected to Plancus, the poem's recipient, at the end of section two.[51] The paraenesis of this second part is joined to the myth of Teucer, which appears in the third section (*Ode* 1.7.21-32), and is reinforced by the repetition of *tristitiam* (*Ode* 1.7.18) and *tristis* (*Ode* 1.7.24).[52] The first and third portions are not linked; this simply imitates the broad sweep and tenuously connected transitions of Pindar's encomia, which were in part Horace's lyric model as was Callimachus' *Aetia*.[53]

It is interesting to note that while Horace alludes lexically to Callimachus' poetry with his *carmine perpetuo*, and less directly to the poetry of Pindar, he has re-deployed this terminology in a setting that emphasizes the difference between Greek and Latin poetry, emphasizing, in fact, his preference for things Latin. Keeping one foot firmly in the Greek poetic tradition via meter and tenuous connections Horace underscores his preference with the exemplum of Teucer, the subject of Pacuvius's famous play.[54]

In his *Ode* 1.7 Horace alludes to Callimachus' *Aetia*, and because the entire poem embraces many poets and genres, it is most likely that he too uses *perpetuo* not to describe a particular poetic genre, but a particular style he rejects. If we accept that with his reference to Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* Callimachus is discussing poetic style, and that in Horace's allusion to Callimachus' ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς he too is discussing poetic style, then it is possible that Ovid, who knew Horace's poetry and the Augustan poetic tradition, of which he had intimate knowledge, is discussing poetic style in the proem of the *Metamorphoses*, not poetic genre.

---

[51] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 93.

[52] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 93.

[53] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 91-93; West (1997), 32.

[54] Cicero treats the story of Teucer in search of a new homeland as an exemplum, probably quoting from Pacuvius' play, *Tusc*. 5.108: *itaque ad omnem rationem Teucri vox accommodari potest*: "*patria est ubicumque est bene*". This same passage is cited by Seneca *Ep.* 8.2. Naturally this topic appears often in Greek literature. See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970), 105-106.

There is another perspective from which we may view Ovid's *perpetuum carmen* in light of Horace's use of this phrase. If Horace understood or chose to understand Callimachus' ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς in a manner different from what we understand Callimachus to mean, then it is equally likely that Ovid could at once allude to Callimachus, yet trope the phrase to suit the circumstances of his own poem. According to Otis Ovid alludes to Callimachus in his proem to assert that his poem would embrace what the *Aetia* rejected,[55] but there seems little point in such a blunt confrontation of texts. Others believe that Ovid's *perpetuum* reinforces the notion of temporal continuity, and thus this is how he understood Callimachus ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς (*Met.*1.3-4):[56] *primaque ab origine mundi / ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen* ("to bring down [or spin] a continuous poem from the first beginnings of the world to my own time"). Ovid himself re-states this notion in his *Trista* 2.557-560:

> atque utinam revoces animum paulisper ab ira,
> et vacuo iubeas hinc tibi pauca legi,
> pauca, quibus prima surgens ab origine mundi
> in tua deduxi tempora, Caesar, opus.
>
> Would that you relent from your anger for a moment,
> and at your leisure ask that a few lines [of the *Metamorphoses*]
> be read to you, the few lines in which, after beginning
> with the origin of the world, I brought the work down
> to your times, Caesar.

Some believe that this temporal interpretation was added by Ovid later, while in exile, but that seems rather more complicated than necessary. We may assume that either Ovid read and understood Callimachus' ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς as referring to temporality, or that Ovid chose to render *perpetuum carmen* to refer to time, while understanding that Callimachus meant a particular poetic style, or that Ovid's allusion to Callimachus is a clever treble entendre: the poet refers to temporal continuity and at the same time to a style of poetry that Callimachus and Horace rejected (as well as that which Callimachus embraced - *deducite*). This would suit Ovid's playful poetic persona that reappears throughout his epic. In this way, then, the proem of the *Metamorphoses* may introduce the *quid* as well as the *quale* of the poem.

---

[55] Otis (1970), 46.

[56] Hollis (1970), xi-xii; Gilbert (1976), 112, n.3; Kenney (1976), 51; and from a Callimachean viewpoint, Cameron (1995), 59-60.

This is all rather speculative given that there are few Latin precedents to Ovid's *perpetuum carmen*. We might tentatively assert that Ovid alludes both to Horace in the use of this phrase and in his troping of it, as well as to Callimachus. Ovid's awareness of or interest in Callimachus' allusion to Homer is impossible to determine.

Because the interpretation of this allusion is, as yet, uncertain, we may make a tentative assessment of it. This would appear to be an integrative allusion since Ovid seems to have merged Callimachus' poetic voice with his own in his proem. As we shall see below, however, the analysis of *deducite*, and Callimachus' use of the adjective λεπτός to which it refers, will have a considerable impact upon the final judgment of Ovid's allusions.

Λεπτός

Λεπτός and its derivatives, such as λεπταλέος, are some of the most scrutinized words in the Hellenistic poetic lexicon.[57] It occurs only once in its most basic, literal sense of "peeled" or "husked" (*Il.* 20.497). From the inception of Greek literature to the Hellenistic period, this adjective frequently occurs in connection with the size, shape, quantity or quality of a physical object;[58] it may describe a space as

[57] Many scholars have examined the use of these adjectives in Hellenistic poetry: e.g. Reitzenstein (1931), 25-39; Puelma Piwonka (1949) 160ff; Wimmel (1960), Stichwortindex s.v.; Cairns (1979), 5; Cameron (1995), 323-328; 330-331; 488-493. After Homer, all meanings of the adjectives are derivatives of the most concrete meaning of the verb as it appears in Homer. See Chaintraine (1968-1980), 631, for etymology and for a lucid categorization and discussion of the adjectives.

[58] λεπτός meaning "peeled" or "husked", of barley, *Il.* 20.497; meaning "fine" or "small" modifying "dust" *Il.*23.506 and in Aristophones' *Clouds* 177 of "ash"; it is compounded meaning "fine-sanded" in Aeschylus' *Supplices* 3 (Aeschylus often used this adjective in compounds; see G.Italie *Index Aeschylus* 1955: 167); "wheat" in Aristophones' *Lysistrata* 1206; it modifies "gnat" in Aristophanes' *Clouds* 161; "bark of a holm-oak" in Theocritus 5.94; "seed" in Nicander's *Theriaca* 900; and "creatures" in his *Alexipharmaca*; in Euripides' *Orestes* 140 the adjective describes a "footprint"; in Theocritus 30.7, a "glance"; in Apollonius Rhodius 2.670 the "first light of dawn", and the skin of the giant Talos, 4.1648; in Lycophron's *Alexandra* 49 the adjective is altered and becomes a name of Persephone; and in Aratus' *Phaenomena* it describes stars: 1.80, 1.166, 1.607, 1.894, 1.906, 1.1042. Of size or of quantity the adjective is also found in Pherecrates Fr. 143.5; Aesop *Fable* 1, version 1 line 16; Herodotus' *Historiae* 7.36.14; and in Callimachus' *Lyrica*, Fr. 228. Referring to the shape of an object it is found in Plato's *Republica* 523b; Aratus' *Phaenomena* 1.783-84; Nicander's *Theriaca* 871; and in his *Alexipharmaca* 430 and 497.

"straight" or "narrow",[59] or it may be used adverbially.[60] The adjective takes on a distinctly negative connotation when it refers to a human or animal body. In this connection the modifier means "thin," "lean," as well as "small," "weak," or "impotent".[61] Recently Cameron wrote that "the earliest examples of λεπτός applied to the intellect occur in Euripides' *Medea*" and that "by Callimachus' day it implied the highest praise: refined, polished, elegant".[62] Though the second statement is true, the first needs some qualification.

It is true that both Euripides and Aristophanes use λεπτός metaphorically quite often in their plays, but the adjective appears twice in the *Iliad* in connection with a person's mind and in this context the connotation is negative. While discussing the Greek plan to infiltrate the Trojan camp at night, Diomedes says (*Il.* 10.224-226):

> σύν τε δύ' ἐρχομένω, καί τε πρὸ ὃ τοῦ ἐνόησεν
> ὅππως κέρδος ἔῃ· μοῦνος δ' εἴ πέρ τε νοήσῃ,
> ἀλλά τέ οἱ βράσσων τε νόος, λεπτὴ δέ τε μῆτις.
>
> When two go together one sees before the other
> how the profit may be had; though a man by
> himself may be careful, still he has less mind
> in him and his less wisdom.

And λεπτός most certainly refers to the mind when, conceding first place in the chariot race to Menelaus, Antilochus says of himself (*Il.* 23.587-590):

> ἄνσχεο νῦν· πολλὸν γὰρ ἐγώ γε νεώτερος εἰμι
> σεῖο, ἄναξ Μενέλαε, σὺ δὲ πρότερος καὶ ἀρείων.

---

[59] *Odyssey* 6.264; Alcman 81; Theocritus 25.155.

[60] As in Aristophanes' *Birds* 235, where it modifies the verb ἀμφιτιττυβίζεθ', or in Theocritus 3.21, where it means "to pluck into small pieces."

[61] Meaning "thin" or "weak"; e.g. *Iliad* 7.36; Alcman 39; Aristophanes, *Ecl.* 539 and *Clouds* 1018; Antiphon 122.4; Hesiod *Works and Days* 497; Theocritus 4.20, 11.69, and 14.3; meaning "small," "weak," or "impotent"; see *Iliad* 7.36, 8.137, 10.226, 23.590; Simonides 37.14; Aesop *Fable* 76, version 1, line 4, and *Fable* 137, version 1, line 4; Herodotus *Historiae* 3.133.5, 8.137.8; Aristophanes *Knights* 1244 and *Clouds* 1018.

[62] Cameron (1995), 323 agrees with Dover, who writes in his commentary of the *Clouds* (1968), 114 that "[T]he earliest datable instance of λεπτός in the sense of 'subtle', (intellectually) refined, is in Euripides' *Medea* 529 (cf. *Hp.* 923 λεπτουργεῖς, and a parody of Euripides in *Ach.* 445). It is naturally a recurrent word in this play (cf. 230, 320, 359) and it is freely used by Ar. thereafter, e.g. *Aves* 318". As we shall see, it is difficult to discern a distinction between the Homeric and fifth-century meanings of λεπτός when applied to mental processes.

οἶσθ' οἷαι νέου ἀνδρὸς ὑπερβασίαι τελέθουσι·
κραιπνότερος μὲν γάρ τε νόος, λεπτὴ δέ τε μῆτις.

Enough now. For lord Menelaus, I am younger by far than you,
and you go before me and are greater.
You know how the transgressions of a young man are.
His mind is hastier and his wisdom (or judgment) is slender.

In these passages we may render λεπτὴ μῆτις as "judgment insufficient for the circumstances", and we detect a distinctly negative value. However we translate these words, we see that Homer first uses λεπτός to describe the workings of the human mind, μῆτις, which Detienne and Vernant have shown to be a type of intelligence and the idea conceived by this intelligence.[63]

Although λεπτός makes its appearance in literature several times subsequent to Homer, the next most notable instances of the adjective occur in the fifth-century drama of Euripides and Aristophanes.[64] To varying degrees scholars have asserted that the literary critical terminology associated with Hellenistic writers was found first in Aristophanes' *Frogs* and that it is to this work that Callimachus alludes in his *Aetia* prologue.[65] In this comedy Aristophanes employs vocabulary appropriated from Euripides' dramas to delineate and satirize that dramatist's style. Upon closer inspection and consideration it seems likely that both Euripides' and Aristophanes' use of λεπτός, along with its negative associations, derive from Homer's usage we have just seen above. As we shall see, this calls into question the assumption that

[63] "There is no doubt that μῆτις is a type of intelligence and of thought, a way of knowing; it implies a complex but very coherent body of mental attitudes and intellectual behavior which combine flair, wisdom, forethought, subtlety of mind, deception, resourcefulness, vigilance, opportunism, various skills, and experience acquired over the years. It is applied to situations which are transient, shifting, disconcerting and ambiguous, situations which do not lend themselves to precise measurement, exact calculation or rigorous logic." Detienne and Vernant (1978), 3-4 and 11-26 in connection with *Il.* 23.590.

[64] For occurrences of forms of λεπτός following Homer, but preceding Euripides see pp. 43-44, footnotes 58 and 61.

[65] See Wimmel (1960), 115 n.1 where links between Hellenistic poetry and the *Frogs* are discussed. Pfeiffer (1968), 137-138 has argued that the similarities between the *Frogs* and *Aetia* prologue are a result of direct borrowing by Callimachus from Aristophanes. Cameron (1995), 321-329 writes that the *agon* of the *Frogs* "most influenced the imagery of the *Aetia* prologue," though he believes that Aratus originated this "Callimachean" use of κατὰ λεπτόν. See also Hopkinson (1988), 89-91 and Cairns (1979), 8-10 who believes that what is now known as "Hellenistic terminology" occurs in the Frogs *agon* in embryonic form.

Callimachus alludes to Aristophanes, or even Euripides, with his use of *κατὰ λεπτόν* and *τὴ*]*ν* Μ*οῦσαν*...*λεπταλέην*.

Forms of *λεπτός* appear several times in the extant work of both Euripides and Aristophanes. From the Homeric usage there evolved the more prevalent usage of the adjective found in fifth-century Attic Greek, a usage signifying "subtlety, finesse, and sophistication," with a less than positive signification. Most scholars have suggested that the intended meaning of Callimachus' *λεπτός* and *λεπταλέην* is "refined" or "sophisticated" but they have not addressed the negative connotation that the adjective carries with it in the plays of Euripides and Aristophanes, nor have they clarified how this negative connotation may be understood within the *Aetia* prologue.[66] Euripides employs *λεπτός* most often to denote something that has been subjected to the human intellect, and therefore has become subtle, refined, and sophisticated, perhaps too much so. For example in the *Hippolytus*, Hippolytus believes his father speaks *too* artfully when he says *ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἐν δέοντι λεπτουργεῖς, πάτερ* ("but father, there is no need for subtle talk"; *Hipp*. 923). In the *Medea* (1082), the chorus applies this adjective to its own "artful arguments," stating that women too have sophisticated, subtle intelligence.

The most common meaning of forms of *λεπτός* found in Aristophanes' comedies is one, like Euripides, related to subtlety, finesse, and sophistication, with an undertone of deception. In the *Lysistrata*, for example, the main character informs Calonice that she has hit upon a scheme developed during many a sleepless night (*Lys*. 25-30):

Λυ *οὐχ οὗτος ὁ τρόπος· ταχὺ γὰρ ἂν ξυνήλθομεν.*
ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ πρᾶγμ' ἀνεζητημένον,
πολλαῖσί τ' ἀγρυπνίαισιν ἐρριπτασμένον.

No it's not that: we would have come fast enough.
It is a scheme I have hit on,
tossing it over many a sleepless night.

66 Chaintraine (1968-1980), 631. Reitzenstein (1931), 37 endorsed the view that Callimachus borrowed from fifth-century handbooks on rhetoric. Pfeiffer (1968), 137-138 seems to be closer to the truth when he states that there is no proof of this hypothesis and because Callimachus demonstrates knowledge of much of fifth-century poetry, it is more likely that the poet borrowed critical terminology directly from the poets of the fifth-century.

Κα   ἦ πού τι λεπτόν ἐστι τοὐρριπτασμένον.

Tossing it over? Then it is light, I think.

Λυ   οὕτω γε λεπτὸν ὥσθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος
ἐν ταῖς γυναιξίν ἐστιν ἡ σωτηρία.

Light? Yes, so light, my dear, that all the hopes
of all the states are anchored on us women.

Calonice jokingly refers to the plan's physical weight, to which Lysistrata replies that her plan is indeed *λεπτός*, thus playing on two of the adjectives meanings, slight physical size or weight, and the subtlety of the plan. Since Lysistrata's plan is to bring peace to Athens, it seems that Aristophanes here appropriates the adjective and employs it to remind the audience of Euripides' scheming women, such as Medea's subtle argument above (*Med.* 1082). So too in the *Archarnians* does Aristophanes use *λεπτός* to allude quite overtly to Euripides' work. After Dicaeopolis quotes what are, the scholiast assures us, two lines from Euripides' now lost *Telephus* (*Ach.* 441-442),[67] the character of Euripides allows him to take costumes from his past productions because he, like many of his own characters, *πυκνῇ γὰρ λεπτὰ μηχανᾷ φρενί* or "subtly plans ingenious schemes" (*Ach.* 445). This explicit reference to Euripides' drama is a parody of his use of vocabulary and work as a whole,[68] but Aristophanes' best-known criticism of Euripides' tragedies appears in the *Frogs*, the comedy whose use of forms of *λεπτός* has led many scholars to believe that this is the author to whom Callimachus alludes with his *λεπταλέην* in the *Aetia* prologue.

It has been suggested that the agon of the *Frogs* most influenced the imagery of the *Aetia* prologue primarily because they share metaphors:[69] Aeschylus is described as *ἐπιβρεμέτας* ("roaring"; *Ra.* 814) while Callimachus claims *βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός* ("it is not for me to thunder, but for Zeus"); Euripides feeds on the upper air (*Ra.* 892), while Callimachus wishes to be a cicada so he can feed on the upper air (*Aetia* Fr. 1.34); compare *Frogs* verse 492: *τὸν ψόφον τῶν ῥημάτων* ("the noise of a pet phrase") with *μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδήν* ("a poem making a great deal of noise"; *Aetia* Fr. 1.19); Dionysus weighs

[67] Sommerstein (1980), 178 and Olson (2002), 187.
[68] On Aristophanes' parody of Euripides' drama in this portion of the *Archarnians* see Olson (2002), 190-192, Sommerstein (1980), 173-179 and Starkie (1968), 86-103.
[69] Snell (1953), 117, Wimmel (1960), 115 n.1, Cairns (1979), 89, and Cameron (1995), 328-331.

poems of Euripides and Aeschylus (*Ra.* 1395-1500) while Callimachus writes of measurements at verse 9, when Philetas' Demeter "outweighs" his "tall lady," and at verses 17-8, when the poet enjoins the audience to judge poetry by its art, not by the "Persian chain".[70] While Callimachus appears to borrow the imagery of the *Frogs'* agon in these instances, does this then mean that his use of the adjective is an allusion to the *Frogs*? If so, then what can we make of his use of an adjective that within this comedy seems to possess a less than positive connotation?[71]

Within the *Frogs* forms of *λεπτός* occur fives times, and Aristophanes does not consistently apply these forms solely to Euripides or Aeschylus: with *καταλεπτολογήσει* or "to waste in subtle talk" (*Ra.* 828) the chorus describes the response they anticipate from Euripides in the agon, and Euripides himself confesses that he introduced common people to *λεπτῶν τε κανόνων* or "subtle rules" (*Ra.* 956). On three occasions Aristophanes applies the adjective to both Euripides and Aeschylus: both possess *λεπτολόγους φρένας* or "subtle intellects" (*Ra.* 876); the chorus urges both playwrights to debate further with *κἀποκινδυνεύετον λεπτόν τι καὶ σοφὸν λέγειν* ("they make a bold attempt to speak subtly and wisely"; *Ra.* 1108); and the chorus states that the audience will understand whatever subtleties the dramatists present in their arguments (*Ra.* 1111). It is perhaps from these occurrences of the adjective that scholars have come to believe that Callimachus refers to Aristophanes' use. While the comic playwright uses forms of *λεπτός* in his characterization of two of the most highly thought of tragedians of fifth century Athens, the adjective must also carry with it the notion of overly artful sophistication, as seen here in the *Frogs*, as well as in Euripides.

---

[70] See Cameron (1995), 330 who believes that Aristophanes' *Frogs* and the *Aetia* prologue share "the concept of comparing stylistic extremes found within the same genre" and that "the difference between the way the two poets developed the idea is (of course) that Aristophanes eventually decided for old-fashioned (Aeschylus), whereas Callimachus emphatically preferred the modern." We may accept Cameron's stance, but in doing so we are not obliged to accept that all of Callimachus' vocabulary was an allusion to Aristophanes and Euripides.

[71] Pfeiffer and Cairns assume that Hellenistic poets derive their critical terminology directly from fifth century poets, but this is not the same as adopting or alluding to a particular word and adopting its lexical meaning. Furthermore, the fact that in the *Frogs* Aeschylus, whose style Callimachus appears to shun, wins while Euripides loses, whose style would appear to be more sympathetic to Callimachus', complicates the interpretation of the adjective.

Perhaps more revealing evidence of Aristophanes' variable usage of *λεπτός* that casts doubt on the theory that Callimachus derived his critical terminology from Aristophanes is found in the *Clouds*. This play is well-known as a critique of Aristophanes' (or perhaps the general public's) conception of sophism and "new" philosophy, both of which are represented in the comedy by the character of Socrates. Here two of the adjective's meaning are distinctly negative. At verses 229-230 Socrates is described as possessing the "subtlest of intellects," *τὴν φροντίδα / λεπτήν*; at verse 320 Strepsiades, infused with Aristophanic Socratic vocabulary, states that his spirit yearns *λεπτολογεῖν* ("to speak subtly"); at verse 359 the chorus uses the superlative of the adjective to mean "oh priest of most subtle nonsense", *λεπτοτάτων λήρων ἱερεῦ*, thus connecting the adjective once more to the idea of sophistic thinking; at verse 740-742 Socrates urges Strepsiades "having let your mind go little by little, speculate about these matters, distinguishing them and contemplating them correctly," *καὶ σχάσας τὴν φροντίδα/λεπτὴν κατὰ μικρὸν περιφρόνει τὰ πράγματα/ὀρθῶς διαιρῶν καὶ σκοπῶν*. Once Strepsiades' son has become acquainted with Socratic thought he asserts that he has been giving all of his attention to *γνώμαις δὲ λεπταῖς καὶ λόγοις* ("to very subtle judgment and words"; 1404). Finally, at verse 1496, Strepsiades speaks of verbally "splitting straws", *διαλεπτολογοῦμαι*.

At this point, if we compare Eurpides' and Aristophanes' use of the adjective to Callimachus' it is difficult to imagine why Callimachus would choose a word with such variable, if not usually negative, meaning to describe his poetic stance in the *Aetia* prologue. If we assume that Callimachus' contemporary reader was well-versed in fifth century Attic drama, then with his use of *λεπτός* Callimachus' allusion to Aristophanes' *Frogs* would have prompted the Hellenistic reader to conceive of *τὴν* Μ*οῦσαν... λεπταλέην* as "slender poetry" and "sophisticated, refined poetry", but also "*overly* refined poetry." We must also assume that the Hellenistic, or even Roman, reader would have been aware of Euripides' use of this adjective, as well as its use in Aristophanes' other plays. If so, then forms of *λεπτός* could not have been a purely positive modifier.

Though this might seem odd, it certainly would not be beyond Callimachus' poetic style to choose a multivalent word to delineate his poetic program. Therefore his use of *λεπτόν* and *λεπταλέην* could be considered allusions to Euripides, Aristophanes, and even Homer, in

whose *Iliad* we first saw the adjective connected with human intellect. As such Callimachus' allusions resonate the notions of artful sophistication and refinement and *over*-refinement or *over*ly artful sophistication; Κατὰ λεπτόν and τὴν Μοῦσαν... λεπταλέην could mean small-scale, slight, refined poetry, but also *overly* artful, and therefore somewhat questionable, poetry. In this way Callimachus might be humorously characterizing his own poetry. Λεπτός occurs in other contexts and evokes other associations, however; just as Callimachus might easily have adopted such an ambivalent adjective for his prologue and may therefore have created an allusion that recalls both positive and negative significations, it is equally possible that he draws upon other notions associated with λεπτός, namely that of spinning and weaving as a metaphor for the creation of poetry. If this is the case then Callimachus' allusions may be once more traced back to Homer and forward to Latin poets who adopted "Callimacheanism" and particular terminology to align their poetry with Callimachus'.

If we return to the occurrences of λεπτός in connection with μῆτις first seen in Homer's *Iliad* discussed above, we need only to recall Greek mythology to discover a fuller semantic value of μῆτις and its possible meaning when coupled with the adjective.[72] The interrelationship of weaving and μῆτις becomes more explicit in two divine figures: the goddess Metis and her daughter Athena. While pregnant with Athena, Metis, the embodiment of the Greek conception of many mental attitudes and intellectual behaviors, was swallowed by her husband Zeus so he would be pure μῆτις.[73] One of the aspects of Athena, the offspring of Metis and Zeus' own μῆτις, is that of the goddess of weaving. She is also "famous among the gods for her mêtis" (*Od.* 13.298-299), and in the *Odyssey* she *weaves* a mêtis (*Od.* 13.303 and 386) for Odysseus.[74] Seen here through the text of Homer, early Greek thought draws an analogy between fabric, poetry, and μῆτις.[75] At this point in Greek literature the poet does not use this nexus to describe his own activities. Homer describes the poet as an ἀοιδός and his poems were

---

[72] See pp. 44-45.

[73] The multivalent character of the goddess Metis is very difficult to describe concisely in the context of this chapter. For an extremely thorough treatment of the Greek conception of this goddess see Detienne and Vernant (1979), 20-21; 57-92; 107-111; 133-146; 179-182; 305-306.

[74] Bergren (1983), 73. For the μῆτις of Athena see Detienne and Vernant (1978), 179-183.

[75] E.g. as Bergren points out (1983), 73 early Greek thought makes connections among these activities by "making each the object of the verb 'to sew' or 'to weave'".

ἀοιδή. The epithet used for singers, their songs, and their voice is *θέσπις ἀοιδή*. Homer's vocabulary for his art and its product centers not on matter, making, and artifact, but on a "special singing sanctioned by divinity".[76] Svenbro has shown that though Homer does not describe a poet's activity in terms of an "art," "skill," or "craft," he does employ old, even some Indo-European, words from the arts and crafts which are applied metaphorically to intellectual and verbal contriving.[77] These metaphors often describe the mental processes that are summed up in the word *μῆτις*. Homer talks of "fitting a snare together" (*Od.* 13.439); "weaving together evil plans" (*Il.* 6.187; 18.637); Odysseus "creates a story" to get some clothing (*Od.* 14.131-132); beggars "fit together lies" (*Od.* 11.363-366); and speakers "weave speeches" (*Il.* 3.212). For the moment it is important to remember that the highly charged word *μῆτις* is often accompanied by forms of *λεπτός* within the context of either depicting cloth production, or in the description of the final product.

In Homer and Greek tragedy forms of *λεπτός*, *λεπταλέος*, and their compounds commonly appear referring indirectly to cloth production, i.e. the adjective describes the finished product of spinning and weaving.[78] Hellenistic poets often used the modifier in the same context.[79] In the *Odyssey* we find several *direct* references to the spinning and weaving process that have clear connections to the workings of the human mind; i.e. spinning and weaving are described and the contexts suggest a relationship between this activity and the mental processes of characters spinning and weaving. For example, *ἱστὸν..λεπτὸν* ("a fine web") is used on three occasions in Homer's depiction of Penelope's cleverness in devising a plan to keep the suitors at bay (*Od.* 2.95, 19.140, and

[76] Ford (1991), 13-18, 32-36.

[77] Svenbro (1976), 193-212.

[78] *λεπτὸν ἄωτον* (*Il.* 9.661), *λεπτὰς ὀθόνας* (*Il.* 18.595), *εἵματ'... λεπτὰ χαρίεντα* (*Il.* 22.510-11), *φᾶρος... λεπτόν* (*Od.* 5.230-31), *πέπλοι... λεπτοὶ* (*Od.* 7.96-97), *φᾶρος... λεπτόν* (*Od.* 10.544), *λεπτόν... πέπλον* (E. *Med.* 786), *λεπτόν... πέπλον* (E. *Med.* 949), *λεπτὰ φάρη* (E. *Hipp.* 133), *λεπτόμιτον φάρος* (E. *Andr.* 831), *λέπτ'... φάρη* (E. *Supp.* 286), *λεπτῶν... καλυμμάτων* (E. *IT* 372.).

[79] *λεπτὰ... χαρίεντα* (Theoc. 15.79), *ἀράχνια... λεπτὰ* (Theoc. 16.96-97), *φᾶρος... λεπταλέον* (A.R. 2.30-31), *χιτῶνας... λεπταλέους* (A.R. 3.874-875), *λεπταλέῳ ἑανῷ* (A.R. 4.169), *λεπτῆς ὀθόνης* (Nic. *Alex.* 625). Other occurrences of *λεπτός* and derivatives *not* related to weaving or spinning are: of a cord (*Il.* 23.854); of the rim of Aeneas' shield (*Il.* 20.275-276); of a cord, reminiscent of Homer (Theoc. 23.51); of spiderwebs (Arat. 1.1033); of the down on the cheeks of a youth (Call. *Hec.* Fr. 274.1); of seaweed (Nic. *Ther.* 787 and 792); of a plant (Nic. *Ther.* 847).

24.130).[80] Homer uses ἀράχνια λεπτά ("fine webs") in his description of the artistic trap Hephaestus creates to catch his faithless wife and Ares (*Od.* 8.280). Λεπτά... ἔργα ("fine works") is used to describe the witch Circe's weaving when Odysseus first catches sight of her (*Od.* 10.233); seconds later she comes out to greet Odysseus and his men and offers them one of her potions. Finally, Penelope is described as spinning, λέπτ' ἠλάκατα ("wool on the distaff"), before she rhetorically asks her son for details of his journey to inquire about his father (*Od.* 17.97). To these occurrences we must add the connections, reviewed above, between λεπτός and μῆτις. These instances clearly demonstrate that in Homer lies the nexus of human intellect and sophisticated, perhaps even deceptive, thinking (as seen also in the scenes of Diomedes and Antilochus, above),[81] and the connection between λεπτός and spinning and weaving, and the human ability to spin or weave a plot. Could this be the basis for the metaphor of spinning or weaving for the creation of poetry?[82]

---

[80] The character of Penelope may be Homer's focal point of the basis of the metaphor for spinning and weaving first for human cleverness and ingenuity, then for the creation of poetry. Her name itself is most likely an echo of weaving terminology. The name "Penelope" is most probably derived from "pênê", "woof" or "loom." See Wust (1940), as well as Didymos on Schol. *Od.* 4.797 and Eustathius on *Od.* 1.343 as ancient sources for this etymology. Furthermore, Whallon (1961) 128 proposes that when Penelope concocts the bow contest, the epithet (περίφρων; "wise", "sage", "prudent" *Od.* 19.559) was designed to remind the audience of her earlier trick of Laertes' shroud – her cleverness in weaving the deception of weaving by day and unweaving by night. This suggests to the audience that Penelope is a schemer like her husband, Athena, Calypso, Circe, the Sirens, and Homer himself. Penelope, then, is the poet's accomplice. For an excellent analysis of Penelope's character see Felson-Rubin (1994). In ancient Greece spinning and weaving were regarded as the activities of virtuous women; see Reeder (1995), 200-202 and Jenkins (1985). Feminine associations with plotting were also often expressed through metaphors of weaving; see Schein (1996), 17-27; Buitron-Oliver and Cohen (1995), 29-58; Murnaghan (1995), 61-80; and Bergren (1983), 71-75. As Bergren points out, the power of the "language" attributed to the female (i.e. weaving, since this is one of the few ways in which women may express themselves) is appropriated by the male, (1983), 72-75. It seems likely that the male poets borrowed from the semantic field of the "feminine" weaving and spinning and applied it to the "masculine" art of poetic composition; see Bergren (1983), 72 who writes, "Greek culture inherits from Indo-European a metaphor by which poets and prophets define themselves using 'weaving' or 'sewing' words"; see also Durante (1960), 241-244.

[81] See pp. 44-45.

[82] For further reading on Penelope and Circe as makers of plots and as the accomplices of Homer see Felson-Rubin (1994); Murnaghan (1995), 129; Winkler (1990), 129-161. It is, of course, Homer whom the character of Hephaetus aids. For an analysis of the blacksmith-god's expertise see Detienne and Vernant (1978), 259-275.

It seems likely that Euripides had the Homeric usage of the adjective in mind while creating two tragedies in which scheming women stand central. Euripides links the modifier to weaving vocabulary to connote human cleverness, and couples it with the concept of human intellect. For example, in the *Medea*, verses 786, 949,[83] and 1188, the dramatist, like his predecessor, applies λεπτός to the finished products of spinning and weaving. Medea reveals that "πέμψω...λεπτόν τε πέπλον καὶ πλόκον χρυσήλατον," she "will send a finely-spun robe and gold coronet" to her rival, the princess to whom Jason is engaged. This finely-woven robe, which was either entirely woven or, at least, magically altered, by her, constitutes one-half of Medea's finely-contrived plot to avenge herself. In the *Hippolytus*, Phaedra is portrayed as more helpless, less guilty than Medea, but nevertheless her schemes are destructive.[84] In the opening of the play the chorus describes Phaedra's state of mind (*Hipp*. 133): "λεπτὰ δὲ φάρη ξανθὰν κεφαλὰν σκιάζειν," "fine-spun cloth shading her blond head." She is also starving herself, which, the audience discovers shortly, is only part of her plan. If the vocabulary figuring Medea's vengeance and Phaedra's finely-spun robes reminds the audience of Homer's finely-spun fabrics and the "womanly" spinning and weaving activities of women, especially those of Penelope and Circe,[85] it is no accident. In the *Medea* we see the first occurrence after Homer of λεπτός explicitly applied to the human intellect when asserting that he owes thanks to Aphrodite alone, Jason states, "σοὶ δ' ἔστι μὲν νοῦς λεπτός" ("you have a subtle mind"; *Med.* 529). The reader will notice, however, that what is perhaps latent in Homer has become explicit in Euripides' dramas since in the latter the adjective takes on a distinctly deceptive connotation; the females of Euripides are characterized as using their great intellects to weave refined plans to the detriment of all those around them, whereas the ethicality of Homer's characters is more ambiguous.

We have observed that Euripides and Aristophanes employ forms of λεπτός to signify something refined and sophisticated, as well as to signify something too refined or sophisticated, sometimes to the point of being deceptive. If Callimachus alludes to these uses of λεπτός in his prologue he might be playfully suggesting that his poetry is refined, but

[83] According to Diggle (1984) verse 949 may be spurious.

[84] For one view of Phaedra's complex character see Hallaran (1995), 40; 42-49.

[85] Euripides certainly makes use of the assumed knowledge that Circe is Medea's aunt.

also overly sophisticated. This might mean that the reader could interpret his poetry to be as ambiguous or humorous as that of Aristophanes or Euripides. We have seen as well that in Homer first there occurs the linking of λεπτός and μῆτις, which in these contexts connotes a turn of the human mind that is less than positive. Also first in Homer, and later in Euripides, we see the connection of λεπτός to spinning and weaving. It seems likely that Callimachus alludes to this aspect of the adjective as well. If so, then his τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν... λεπταλέην means not only a "refined poem" or "overly refined poem," but a "well-spun" or "finely-woven" or perhaps even a "deceptive poem." This too suits the character of the *Aetia* well; it is a collection of disparate tales woven together. Though "deception" possesses a clearly negative value within the English language and present-day Western culture, we should remember the ancient Greek mindset was less absolute and more nuanced. We need only consider the main character of the *Odyssey*, for example, who was admired for his deceptiveness, or as we might say today, his "resourcefulness." Could we not take Callimachus' double reference to Homer, as well as his collection and assemblage of tales in the *Aetia* to mean "resourceful" as well as refined?

If we classify terms the lexical allusions Callimachus has constructed with his use of λεπτόν and λεπταλέην in Contean we would view them, like the multilayered reference called forth with διηνεκές, as integrative. The "old" texts merge into Callimachus' "new" text to the extent that the reader is not jarred from the first reading and accepts these adjectives at face value: "the small-scale" and "the slender Muse." Even after subsequent readings and the recollection of the multiple "old" meanings and contexts of this adjective, and application of them to the Callimachean context, the "old" fuses with the "new" text and a more sophisticated whole and a new, single word is created. These allusions call forth the Homeric, Euripidean, and Aristophanean use of these adjectives so that the reader may understand that Callimachus was urged by Apollo to produce a "slender poem," a subtle and sophisticated poem, an *overly* sophisticated poem, as well as a finely-spun poem.

How might these allusions to Homer, Euripides, and Aristophanes impact our understanding of the generic implications of the *Aetia* prologue? It was noted above that Callimachus' allusion via the adjective διηνεκές appears to reinforce the idea that the poet would like to emphasize the importance of poetic style, not poetic genre, in this

prologue. His reference via forms of λεπτός would seem to function similarly; because Callimachus alludes to both epic and drama with this term that defines favorable or acceptable poetics. Once again, the poet signals that genre is not the issue of the *Aetia* prologue. To underscore this notion it should be added that Harder has recently shown that due to the great number of allusions to literature of various genres that Callimachus makes throughout his introduction, the poet's view on "proper" poetic style can not be encompassed by elegy or epic only.[86]

If we accept that Callimachus alludes to Homer's and Euripides' use of the term λεπτός, then his terminology would be more definitively connected to "Callimachean" poetic ideals of Latin poets who adopted these ideals, particularly forms of the participle *deductum,* which one of the Latin renderings of λεπτός and often denotes the idea of spinning and weaving for the creation of poetry. The following discussion, an examination of Latin poets's use of *deductum*, will suggest that Callimachus intended his audience to recognize that *κατὰ λεπταλέην* and *τὴ*]*ν* Μ*οῦσαν*... *λεπταλέην* were primarily allusions to Homer, one of the original sources who inspired much of Callimachus poetry.[87]

Deductum

The *deducite* in conjunction with the *carmen* of the proem of the *Metamorphoses* is a key term in Augustan poetry. As already mentioned, scholars believe that Ovid's *deducite*… *carmen* implies a programmatic statement equivalent to Callimachus' *τὴ*]*ν* Μ*οῦσαν*...

[86] See Harder (2002), esp. pp. 16-20. This view contrasts with Cameron's (1995), who maintains that Fr. 1 is about the proper sort of elegy.

[87] This examination of λεπτός would not be complete without mention of an allusion Callimachus seems to make to Euripides and Homer that suggests a discussion of the auditory elements of poetry. In the *Hymn to Artemis* (242-243), within a description of the dance performed by the Amazons for the goddess, the poet describes the syrinx as *λεπταλέον*: *ὑπήεισαν δὲ λίγειαι/λεπταλέον σύριγγες, ἵνα ῥήσσωσιν ὁμαρτῇ·* Euripides uses this adjective as well within a similar context in his *Orestes* (145-146): *ἆ ἆ σύριγγος ὅπως πνοὰ/λεπτοῦ δόνακος, ὦ φίλα, φώνει μοι.* The lexical connections between these two passages suggest that Callimachus is alluding to Euripides, but there is a compelling Homeric precedent for the use of λεπτός in this context at *Il.* 18.569-571, within the ecphrasis of the Shield of Achilles, in which Homer describes the voice of a boy singing, playing his lyre, while other children harvest grapes: *τοῖσιν δ' ἐν μέσσοισι πάις φόρμιγγι λιγείῃ/ἱμερόεν κιθάριζε, λίνον δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδε/λεπταλέῃ φωνῇ.* It is difficult to discern precisely to whom Callimachus is alluding. However, Callimachus seems to be comfortable, as was Homer, employing λεπτός within descriptions of both the compositional and auditory aspects of poetry.

λεπταλέην (*Aetia* Fr. 1.24), and therefore to the poetic ideals expressed there. Nevertheless it will prove useful to review precisely how Ovid's Latin poetic predecessors used this phrase in order to determine if he alludes primarily to Callimachus or to him as well as to other Latin poets, and how a possible combination of allusions might alter our interpretation of the *Metamorphoses'* prologue.

Forms of *deducere* are rather common in Latin prose and poetry, but, particularly in Latin poetry, the verbal forms of *deducere* may mean, as a weaver's technical term, to draw or spin out a thread or yarn, and by metonomy they may mean to prepare a web or to weave. Participial forms of the verb may mean "to spin out a literary composition like a thread," a meaning that is found in poetry and in post-Augustan prose, and are seen together with the adjective and are cited as meaning *tenuis* ("thin", "fine" or "slight") in Horace (*Ep*. 2.1.225).[88] This might suggest that *deducere* must be used together with the adjective *tenuis* to fully translate the Callimachean λεπτός. However, Horace in his *Ars Poetica* (which will be discussed below) and Manilius in the proem to his epic poem (also examined in this chapter) use forms of *deducere* without the adjective and are cited as meaning "finely spun out".[89] Just as Greek poets use spinning and weaving terminology as a metaphor for the creation of poetry, so too do the Latin poets who admired and emulated them. This metaphor is first evident in the work of Catullus, the neoteric poet known for his adoption of the "Callimachean" aesthetic and known to have greatly influenced the Augustan poets.[90] *Deducens* linked to *fila* in c. 64 is not an exact lexical parallel to Ovid's usage, nor does it occur in the poem's introduction.[91] It is, however, both a metaphor for the creation of poetry and an

[88] See *A Latin Dictionary* Lewis and Short (1879); the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968.); and *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (1900 -).

[89] *A Latin Dictionary* Lewis and Short (1879); the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968); and *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (1900 -) which lists the perfect passive participle as being used "*de carmine et oratione*" and "*componere carmina*". After Ovid the verb took on a meaning very like one of the the more common meanings of λεπτός: "to make finer, thinner, weaker" or "to attenuate" (Quintilian 1.4.16 and Macrobius *Sat.* 6.4).

[90] For Catullus' relationship to Callimachus and the neoterics' influence on Augustan poetry see Ross (1975).

[91] I have privileged forms of *deducere* as the Latin translation of Callimachus' λεπτόν and λεπταλέην rather than including other words poets employed as translations of these "Callimachean" words for two reasons: 1. This chapter is primarily an examination of the lexical allusions that appear in the proem of the *Metamorphoses* and the prologue of the *Aetia*. As such, the examination is confined to the boundaries of the terminology found in those verses; 2. As Ross has pointed out, modern audiences are

allusion to Callimachus' τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν... λεπταλέην. Catullus' words most obviously describe the literal actions of the three Fates and given that their epithalamium that follows predicts the birth, achievements, and death of Achilles, they suggest the spinning of destinies for which these goddesses were renowned and feared.[92] The reader notices that the spinning of the Fates serves a third purpose—they also aid the poet in the creation of his poem (Cat. *c*. 64.311-313):

> Laeva colum molli lana retinebat amictum,
> dextra tum leviter deducens fila supinis
> formabat digitis…
>
> The left hand was holding the distaff wrapped in soft wool;
> Then the right, lightly drawing down threads with upturned
> fingers was shaping them…

The neoteric and Augustan poets seldom employed actual parallels to Callimachus' poetry.[93] Therefore when we detect a similarity in terminology we should read and reflect carefully. Two apparent allusions to the *Aetia* prologue that appear in Horace's work merit attention. *Deducta poemata*, once again not an exact lexical match with Ovid's *deducite... carmen*, appears in Horace's *Epistula ad Augustum*, within a portion of the letter in which the poet explains the value of a poet to a ruler; using the metaphor of spinning quite like Catullus' he explains the labors of poetic composition (*Ep*. 2.1.224-225):

> cum lamentamur non apparere labores
> nostros et tenui deducta poemata filo
>
> when we complain that our work and
> our poems spun with a fine thread
> are not visible

relatively accustomed to *carmen deductum* and, therefore, forget the forcefulness of it. See Reitzenstein (1931), 25-40 and Wimmel (1960), Stichwortindex s.v. λεπτός and *passim*. *Deductum carmen*, unlike *tenue* or *gracile carmen*, is anything but an obvious translation of λεπτός.

[92] Catullus lavished attention upon his description of the spinning process, emphasizing the metaphor of spinning as the creation of poetry. Quinn (1973), 339 points out that "Catullus' description is organized round four focal points: (1) the action of the left hand (311); (2) the twin actions of the right hand (312-314); (3) the action of the tooth (315-317); (4) the image of the baskets of wool waiting to be spun (318-319)."

[93] Actual parallels being "lines or passages closely imitated or even translated, forms copied, poems adapted", Ross (1975), 6-7.

We immediately notice that Horace emphasizes the metaphor by enclosing *deducta poemata* with *tenui* and *filo*, two words associated with "Callimachean" poetic ideals.[94] This phrase may be translated literally, as Rudd suggests,[95] or as "refined poems". Either way the metaphor of spinning is explicit and it is interesting to note that this allusion appears within the context of describing a poet's calling.

The second apparent allusion is a precise lexical parallel to Ovid's terminology; it appears in Horace's *Epistula ad Pisones*, otherwise known as *Ars Poetica* (128-130):

> tuque
> rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus
> quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus.
>
> and you do better in spinning into acts a
> song of Troy than if, for the first time, you offer
> a theme unknown and unsung.

Here the phrase is certainly suggestive of the metaphor of spinning, but because of its context within an advisory work, and its meaning within this context ("it would be *better* for you to write a tragedy about Troy than to write about something the audience knows nothing about"), it does not immediately recall the "Callimachean" poetic aesthetic and, therefore, seems to be an "indirect" allusion to Callimachus; though a poet may use highly charged language, because of the context of these words they can be at most reminiscent; the context of programmatic language matters .[96]

As we have seen, not every occurrence of a phrase similar to *deductum carmen* in Latin poetry is the sign of a programmatic statement. In many poets' work we find that this phrase, instead of recalling Callimachus' poetry or the metaphor of spinning and weaving, is simply synonymous with poetic refinement. A good example of this occurs

---

[94] See e.g. Quinn (1973), xxix-xxxi and Clausen (1994), 181.

[95] Rudd (1989), 113.

[96] Though there are clear parallels to other passages in Latin literature, and though there are clear connections from Latin literature to Callimachus' *Aetia*, Rudd (1989), 113 believes that "the metaphor for spinning and weaving occurred in some lost passages of Alexandrian poetry" and that "as it is, we have no Greek parallel for Virgil's *deductum dicere carmen* and Horace's *deducta poemata* here." Examples of how Horace alludes to Callimachus' poetry: *Satire* 1.10.31-2: *cum Graecos facerem... versiculos* cf. Virgil's *Ecl.* 6.3 *cum canerem reges et proelia*; *Satire* 1.10.36-37: *turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque / defingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo* and *Satire* 1.10.74: *contentus paucis lectoribus*; *Odes* 4.2.31-32: *operosa parvus / carmina fingo*.

in.the penultimate poem of Propertius' second book of elegies. In this poem the poet chides Isis for the abstinence she imposes on his lover; the poet then invites Cynthia, his lover, to come to him after this period of abstinence, and later in the poem he tries to gain his lover's attention at a drinking party (Prop. 2.33B.35-40):[97]

> me miserum, ut multo nihil est mutata Lyaeo!
> Iam bibe: formosa's: nil tibi vina nocent,
> cum tua praependent demissae in pocula sertae,
> et mea deducta carmina voce legis.
> largius effuso madeat tibi mensa Falerno,
> spumet et aurato mollius in calice.

> Mercy on us! She is not one bit affected by so much drinking! Well, drink on: you are beautiful: wine harms you not at all when garlands hang over your face and dip into your cups and you read my poems with a dainty voice. Let the table swim even more liberally with floods of Falernian, let it bubble more lusciously in your golden goblet.

We notice immediately that *deducta* does not syntactically rely upon *carmina* (verse 38), but upon *voce*, Cynthia's voice. Some have interpreted Propertius‘ *deducta voce* to mean a querulous or plaintive voice, while others believe it suggests a drunken one.[98] Another possibility, considering the unusual choice of adjective, is that *deducta* draws upon the metaphor of spinning and weaving, and, therefore, is suggestive of some poetic aspect of Cynthia's voice; perhaps while reading Propertius' poetry her voice becomes refined, or perhaps her refined voice lends refinement to his poetry.[99] The likelihood that this may indeed be an allusion to Callimachus' poetry becomes greater when we consider that larger context: a drinking party in which the narrator observes that his beloved is not affected by *multo… Lyaeo* ("much drinking"). Harder has discussed the programmatic nature of Callimachus' Fr. 178, particularly how the poet underlines the dangers of excessive drinking

---

[97] It is uncertain whether verses 23-42 belong to c. 33 or if they form a separate poem. Verses 23-42 are presented in the MSS as continuous with the preceding ones. If taken as a whole poem, observe that there is symmetry in organization of ideas. For the sometimes seemingly disjointed nature of Propertius‘ poetry, see Camps (1967), 216-222.

[98] Commentators are undecided on the exact meaning of *deducta voce*. See Camps (1967), 216-222, and Butler and Barber (1933), 253-254.

[99] Goold (1990), 236-237 suggests the latter interpretation in his translation of the poem. This in turn may an allusion to the λεπταλέῃ φωνῇ of *Il.* 18.571.

via allusions to the *Odyssey.*[100] In this portion of the *Aetia* the narrator shares a couch and erudite conversation with Theogenes, whom he describes as Ician and as hating the greedy Thracian draught of wine, and liking a small cup (*Aetia* Fr. 178.8;11-12). This implies that the reader may anticipate a story told in a Callimachean manner and that excessive drinking may be analogous to the poetry the poet eschews in the Fr. 1. If this is an allusion to Callimachus' Fr. 178, it must be reflective; Propertius' narrator makes it clear that Cythnia has indeed drunk excessively, but that even so her voice is *deducta.* Whichever interpretation one chooses, the juxtaposition of *deducta* and *carmina* reminds the audience of Callimachus' *τὴν Μοῦσαν... λεπταλέην*, though the phrase does not possess programmatic implications and does not fully engage the metaphor of weaving and spinning for poetic creation.

Within another poem in his collection Propertius uses the verb *deduxi* with *carmina* as its object. The door of the beloved quotes an anonymous lover: *at tibi saepe novo deduxi carmina versu* ("But I have often spun poems in new verse for you"; Prop. 1.16.41). This verse suggests that Propertius has "spun" poetry for his Cynthia. Furthermore, it seems to suggest that by Propertius' time the metaphor of spinning poetry had become something of a commonplace that possessed a "Callimachean" connotation not necessarily employed to assert a unique poetic voice or a programmatic statement.

In fact, if we search for explicit references to this Hellenistic poet, we will find that Propertius employs different terminology for this purpose. For example, in the introductory poem of Book 2 the poet addresses Maecenas and states that if he were able to write epic poetry he would sing about *bellaque resque…Caesaris* ("wars and the concerns of Caesar"; Prop. 2.1.25), not mythological themes. He continues, using now familiar Callimachean terminology (Prop. 2.1.39-42):

sed neque Phlegraeos Iovis Enceladique tumultus
intonet angusto pectore Callimachus,
nec mea conveniunt duro praecordia versu
Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen avos.

But would Callimachus not thunder the battle in the
Phlegraean fields between Jupiter and Enceladus
with a limited heart, neither is my heart congenial
to placing the name of Caesar within his Trojan

[100] Harder (2002), 212-217.

ancestors with cramped verse.

Compare Propertius' *intonet* to Callimachus' *βροντᾶν* ("to thunder") at *Aetia* 1.20 and *angusto* to *κατὰ λεπτόν* ("small-scale") at *Aetia* 1.11. In his tenth elegy of the second book the poet for a moment affects to be on the brink of abandoning love poetry and to write a *magni... oris opus* ("a work of great expression"; Prop. 2.10.12), about *tumultus* and *bella* ("tumult", "war"; Prop. 2.10.7-8), and the achievements of Augustus. A few lines later, at verse 19, he declares in the future tense that he will do this once his poetic skills are powerful enough. In the first poem of the third book Propertius declares *Callimachi manes et Coi sacra Philitae,/ in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus* ("I beg you, shades of Callimachus and poems of Philitas of Cos, allow me to enter into your grove"; Propertius 3.1.1-2) and uses imagery seen in Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue: *puro de fonte sacerdos* ("priest from the pure fountain"; Prop. 3.1.3), *quo carmen tenuastis in antro* ("in what cave did you make your poem slender?"; Prop. 3.1.5), *exactus tenui pumice versus eat* ("Let verse be finished with a light pumice stone"; Prop. 3.1.8), *non datur ad Musas currere lata via* ("It is not given [to us] to reach the Muses by a broad road"; Prop. 3.1.14), *intacta... via* ("untouched path"; Prop. 3.1.18), and *invida turba* ("envious crowd"; Prop. 3.1.21). In the third poem of the third book Propertius alludes to both Ennius and Callimachus when he writes that when he was about to drink from the same fountain from which Ennius drank so that he might write a Roman epic, Apollo warned him away from this aspiration. Apollo's speech here clearly is based upon Callimachus' patron god's speech: *quid tibi cum tali*, *demens*, *est flumine* ("madman, what is your business with that river?"; Prop. 3.3.15) and *mollia sunt parvis prata terenda rotis* ("soft are the meadows where your little wheels should roll"; Prop. 3.3.18). Apollo shows the poet a *nova... semita* ("new footpaths"; Prop. 3.3.26) and Calliope symbolically wets his lips with *Philitea... aqua* ("water of Philetas"; Prop. 3.3.52).

Since Propertius employs a particular set of vocabulary, in addition to the *deducta carmina* of 2.33.38 and the *deduxi carmina* of 1.16.41, to allude to Callimachus' poetry, what is the significance of the forms of the programmatic *deducere*? It seems most likely that Propertius has chosen to use this phrase to send the reader's mind briefly to the poetry of Callimachus, just as Horace did. In other words, the poet has created a reference that does not fully engage the context of the reference, nor

does it add significantly to the central message of his own poem.[101] That is to say that not every allusion to programmatic passages in Callimachus' poetry are sites at which Horace or Propertius delineate their stance vis-à-vis poetry.

One poet writing perhaps contemporaneous with, but most certainly just after, Ovid who uses a form of *deducere* together with *carmen* within the proem of his work is the lesser-known Augustan poet, Manilius. Manilius also employs the metaphor for spinning in the introductory paragraphs of both Book 1 and Book 2 of his *Astronomica.* In true programmatic form Manilius sets forth for his reader not only the contents, the *quid*, but the style of his poem, the *quale.* Notice, however, that while the requisite vocabulary is used to allude to the Augustan tradition of the "Callimachean" aesthetic, or perhaps even directly to Manilius' Greek models,[102] the phrase here and in the proem of the second book does not mean "to spin a poem" (*Astronomica* 1.1-6):

> Carmine divinas artes et conscia fati
> sidera diversos hominum variantia casus,
> caelestis rationis opus, deducere mundo
> aggredior primusque novis Helicona movere
> cantibus et viridi nutantis vertice silvas
> hospita sacra ferens nulli memorata priorum.
>
> By means of song I attempt to draw down from
> heaven divine skills and fate's accomplices, the
> stars, which by the work of divine reason diversify
> the various fortunes of man; and to be the first to
> move Helicon with new songs and the woods nodding
> their green peaks as I bring sacred lore related by none
> before me.

Carmine... deducere... aggredior ("By means of song I attempt to draw down"; Manilius 1.1-4) is obviously part of his programmatic statement, as is the phrase when it appears in the opening of the second book of his didactic work. In the introduction to this second book Manilius first summarizes the contents of Homer's two epics, then writes of how so many have used his poetry in the creation of their own (*Astronomica* 2.7-11):

[101] The occurrence of *deducta… voce* also suggests the auditory aspects of poetry described as λεπτός in Homer, Euripides, and Callimachus.

[102] Manilius most likely modelled his poem upon Aratus' *Phaenomena.*

> Patriam cui turba petentum,
> dum dabat, eripuit, cuiusque ex ore profusos
> omnis posteritas latices in carmina duxit
> amnemque in tenuis ausa est deducere rivos
> unius fecunda bonis.
>
> The crowd of those seeking his birthplace,
> While it gives, it snatches it away, from whose
> mouth all posterity has drawn on rich streams
> and has dared to lead down his river into
> thin streams, rich in the wealth of one.

Both of these passages demonstrate that Manilius' use of *carmen* and *deducere* is central to his programmatic statement and serve as references to his Latin and Greek predecessors. Because the phrase cannot literally mean "a finely-spun poem", like Propertius these allusions only serve to call to the reader's mind the notion of a refined poem.

Thus far we have seen that Ovid's poetic predecessors (and one contemporary) used *deductum carmen*, or a variation thereof, as a metaphor for the creation of poetry, which also serves as a reference to Callimachus' *τῆν Μοῦσαν... λεπταλέην*. Therefore it would seem that either these poets recognized the multiple meanings of *λεπτός*, which we have traced back to Homer and forward to Callimachus, or they chose to render the adjective with a verb or participle that could also be used metaphorically. Either way, the phrase seems to become synonymous with poetic refinement, and contexts do not always fully engage the notion of spinning for the creation of poetry.

Given that Augustan poets often used other means of alluding to Callimachus' work, when we do encounter this phrase in a programmatic context, we should pay careful attention to what the poet is telling us. The phrase *deductum carmen*, which reproduces Callimachus' *τῆν Μοῦσαν... λεπταλέην* complete with a defense of a particular poetic stance, occurs first in extant Latin literature within the *recusatio* of Virgil's *Eclogue* 6,[103] in which the poet contrasts his project in this collection of poems with heroic poems concerning kings and battles. Here *deductum carmen* is a term of approval denoting polish and refinement (*Eclogue* 6.1-8):

---

[103] It should be pointed out that the *recusatio* as thought of today, though often found in Hellenistic poetry, is post-Callimachean; i.e. the prologue of the *Aetia* is not a *recusatio* at all. For a complete analysis of the Augustan *recusatio* see Cameron (1995), 454-483 and for a view of Propertius' use of the *recusatio* see Brouwers (1985), 203-213.

Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu
nostra nec erubuit silvas habitare Thalea.
Cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem
vellit et admonuit: ‘pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen.’
nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
agrestem tenui mediabor harundine Musam:

My muse first considered it worthy to play in
Sicilian verse and was not embarrassed to live
in the woods. When I sang of kings and battles,
Apollo tweaked my ear and warned me: “Tityrus
a shepherd should feed his sheep fat, but sing a
fine-spun song.” Varus you will find many eager to
praise you, and to write about the story of sad wars;
now I will consider the rustic muse with a slender reed.

The poet marks his ostensibly Theocritean pastoral poem as essentially Callimachean with a direct reference to the preface of the *Aetia,* and includes words connoting refinement as opposed to crudeness (*deductum... carmen*, “a fine-spun song”; *Ecl.* 6.5; *tenui... harundine*, “with a slender reed”; *Ecl.* 8) and lightness opposed to gravity (*ludere* versus *cum canerem*, “to play” versus “when I sang”; *Ecl.* 1 and 3).[104] Should his reader think that these verses are simply references to neoteric or contemporary poets,[105] Virgil sends clear signals that the allusion is to the *Aetia* prologue by accentuating one important departure from the Callimachean passage in order to emphasize the genre of his poetry: Callimachus’ Apollo bids the poet to fatten his sacrificial victim (θύος, *Aetia* 1.23), whereas Virgil’s Apollo tells the shepherd-poet to fatten his flock (*ovis; Ecl.* 6.3).[106] Perhaps even more revealing is the privileged position of *deductum carmen*. Had Virgil chosen to describe the

[104] Clausen (1994), 174-178 has pointed out that though Virgil bases his *Eclogues* on Theocritus’ pastoral poetry, stylistically this collection owes much more to Callimachus’ poetry. Ross (1975), 18-38 has observed that in this poem Virgil makes references to all the great Hellenistic poets. It is notable, then, that he chooses to begin this poem with an allusion to the prologue of the *Aetia*. Ross (1975), 19 first remarked on the parallels between the two introductions.

[105] Coleman (1977) and Clausen (1994) show that the metaphor denoted by the use of *deducere* was commonly used in discussions and explanations of literary style, e.g. Horace *Ep*. 2.1.225 (as we shall see below), Cicero *Or*. 20, Quintilian 10.144, and implicitly Horace *S*. 2.1.4.

[106] Scholars have identified this reference in varying degrees. Ross’ analysis is by far the most complete; Ross (1975), 18-38. See also Clausen (1994), 174-181. For Virgil’s variation of Apollo’s advice to the poet see Pfeiffer (1928), 322.

poetry Apollo prescribed as *tenuis*, aside from posing a metrical problem, the adjective would not have recreated the metaphor of spinning and weaving explicit in the λεπτόν and λεπταλέην of the *Aetia* prologue.[107] However, if we accept that Callimachus' τὴν Μοῦσαν… λεπταλέην is indeed an allusion to Homer, an allusion that calls upon the epic poet as "proof" of the notion that one should spin or weave a story or poem, then how should we understand Virgil's allusion? Is it a reference to both Callimachus and Homer? One might speculate that Virgil simply did not pick up on Callimachus' allusion to Homer, but this seems highly unlikely given what we know of Virgil's poetic abilities. If Virgil was aware of Homer's double use of forms of λεπτός, as well as its use in Euripides and Aristophanes, he would probably not be referring to the adjective's connotation of "overly refined" or "overly sophisticated", given the aura of simplicity that pastoral poetry commonly evokes. Instead it seems more likely that if Virgil alludes to Homer's use of λεπτός, it would rather be to the adjective in connection with spinning and weaving and the creation of plots. There is one other rather important distinction between signification of *deductum carmen* here in the *Eclogues* and Callimachus' use of forms of λεπτός. We have seen that Callimachus used this adjective to refer to a particular poetic style, not to poetic genre. Here in the *Eclogues* Virgil adequately defines his preferred poetic style with the use of *Syracosio… ludere versu* ("to play in Sicilian verse"; *Ecl.* 6.1) and *tenui… harundine* ("with a slender reed"; *Ecl.* 6.8). The alternation of the phrases *cum canerem reges et proelia* ("When I sang of kings and battles"; *Ecl.* 6.3), *deductum… carmen* ("fine-spun song"; *Ecl.* 6.5), and *super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes / Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella* ("Varus you will find many eager to praise you, and to write about the story of sad wars"; *Ecl.* 6.7) suggests that Virgil appropriates the phrase *deductum carmen* and redeploys it to connote poetic genre, not style.

Cameron has recently asked the logical question: why does Virgil adopt so many elements of the *Aetia* prologue while dropping its

---

[107] Though he elects not to use *deductum carmen*, the contrast between the slender Muse and the fat sacrificial victim is implicit in the concluding lines of *Ecl.* 10 (70 and 77*): haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poetam* and *ite domum saturae, venit Hesperos, ite capellae*, and still more clearly programmatic is the end of *Ecl.* 3 (111): *claudite iam rivos, pueri: sat prata biberunt.*

central feature, i.e. polemic?[108] His answer is that Virgil alludes to Callimachus' prologue but has redeployed the terminology within a *recusatio*, which originated in Hellenistic poetry, but is post-Callimachean.[109] The *recusatio* formulation of Virgil's programmatic statement necessitates an alteration of the context to which he refers. For example, Virgil's Apollo advises the poet after he had begun to write about *reges et proelia* (*Ecl.* 6.3), whereas Callimachus' Apollo guides the poet from the beginning. Where Callimachus writes that he rejected "kings" and, most probably, "heroes", Virgil writes of "kings and wars", which is then emphasized by the *tristia bella* of verse 7. The *Aetia* prologue includes kings and heroes, but no wars. Here and in several *recusationes* of Augustan poets the poet directly addresses the person whose deeds he declines to celebrate; of course there is no dedicatee whom Callimachus addresses. Finally, whereas one may read polemic in the *Aetia* prologue, there is no hint of that in Virgil's *Eclogue*. Virgil simply refuses to write of kings and wars, i.e. epic; he does not denounce epic or does he extol the virtues of his chosen genre.[110] Cameron has shown that the *Aetia* prologue was the principal source for Augustan *recusatio*. Perhaps for this reason, as well as to indicate the *quale* of his poetry, Virgil chose to allude to it.

Following the precedent of Virgil, Ovid first uses this metaphor of spinning for the creation of poetry in a rather different context than the *Metamorphos*—in the light-hearted *recusatio* of his second book of the *Amores*.[111] In this playful introduction the poet tells the reader how and why he gave up heroic poetry in favour of love poetry (*Am.* 2.1.23-28):

carmina sanguineae deducunt cornua lunae,
et revocant niveos solis euntis equos;
carmine dissiliunt abruptis faucibus angues,
inque suos fontes versa recurrit aqua.
carminibus cessere fores, insertaque posti,

---

[108] Concerning the general influence of Callimachus upon the Roman poets see Wimmel (1960), and more recently Thomas (1993), 197-215. Cameron (1995), 455; cf. Schmitz (1999) 151-178, who sees the *Aetia* prologue not as polemic, but as a kind of elaborate *captatio benevolentiae*.

[109] Though the *Aetia* prologue is the main source for the Augustan *recusatio*, it is not a *recusatio*. A simple *recusatio* appears in the poetry of Bion and in the so-called *Anacreontea*; Cameron (1995), 455.

[110] Cameron points out that the *recusationes* of other Augustan poets go even further, even implying that epic is superior to their own poetry and that they lack the powers to write epic; Cameron (1995), 455.

[111] Ovid also used this metaphor in the *Fasti* 1.709-710 and subsequent to the *Metamorphoses*, *Tristia* 1.1.39.

quamvis robur erat, carmine victa sera est.

Song brings down the horns of the blood-red moon,
and calls back the snowy horses of the setting sun;
by means of song serpents with their throats destroyed
burst asunder, and it sends the waters rushing back upon
their source. Doors have given way because of songs,
and the bolt inserted in the post, although of oak, has
been made to yield by song.

Carmina… deducunt (*Am.* 1.1.23), emphasized by the four-fold repetition of forms of *carmen*, must be translated "poems bring (or pull) down the horns of the bloody moon"; naturally the phrase here cannot be translated "refined" or "fine-spun poems". If we stop at this point we might conclude that Ovid uses these charged words much as Horace and Propertius do. But the appearance of these words within a *recusatio* recalls the same metaphor that appears in Virgil's *Eclogue* 6 and that of the *Aetia* prologue, and encourages the reader to recognize this as a reference to both. Both Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue (though not a *recusatio* in the strict sense) and Virgil's *Eclogue* 6 provide justification for writing poetry as they do, as does Ovid's introductory poem. The reader might think that Ovid's use of *carmina… deducunt* is more closely related to Virgil's since the subject matter of both poets is professed to be "light": *ludere* (*Ecl.* 6.1) and *blanditias elegosque levis* (*Am.* 2.1.21). Furthermore, like Virgil and unlike Callimachus' prologue, this is non-polemical. However, the imagery of Ovid's *Am.* 2.1 indicates a closer alliance to the *Aetia* prologue. Earlier in the *Amores* Ovid informs the reader that he had "dared to sing of the wars of heaven, and Gyas of the hundred hands, and steep Ossa…" and that he had "in his hands the thunder-clouds, and Jupiter was to hurl his own lightening" when the poet let the god drop because his beloved closed her door to him (*Am.* 2.1.11-17). That is to say, Ovid chose not to thunder; this seems to be an echo of Callimachus' claim *βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός* ("it is not for me to thunder"; *Aetia*, Fr. 1.20). Just as *Amores* 2.1 explains rather humorously why Ovid adopted a particular style and subject matter for these elegies, in the *Aetia* prologue Callimachus uses *κατὰ λεπτόν* and *τὴν Μοῦσαν… λεπταλέην* to help explain his own poetic style. There are, however, important differences between the Latin and Greek poets. The Apollo who advises Callimachus and Virgil is rather humorously replaced by Ovid's *amor* (*Am.* 2.1.3; 38) and his beloved (*Am.* 2.1.17-22). On a more serious note,

both Virgil and Ovid seem to rely upon *carmen* in conjunction with a form of *deducere* to help excuse themselves for writing a particular genre of poetry, pastoral and elegy respectively, whereas Callimachus relies upon forms of λεπτός to justify a particular poetic style.

Considering the data concerning *deductum carmen* gathered thus far, we find that while it is clear that Latin poets were well-acquainted with the term and with the metaphor of spinning for the creation of poetry invoked by it, few use this exact phrase and make a programmatic statement with it. Catullus, in *c*. 64, and Horace, in his *Epistula ad Augustum*, do not use the precise terminology, nor are the phrases' contexts programmatically significant, though the phrases activate the metaphor for poetic creation. We have also seen that Latin poets, such as Horace and Propertius, employ the exact lexical parallel of Ovid's *deducite carmen* that evokes the metaphor, but the context reveals that at most these are allusions designed only to remind the reader of Callimachus' poetic style; perhaps these poets allude to Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue directly, though it is just as likely that they refer to it through the Latin reception of Callimachus. The contexts in these instances make it very difficult to determine precisely. In fact, Virgil's *Eclogues* 6 is the only instance in Latin poetry prior to the *Metamorphoses* in which the poet uses terminology identical to Ovid's to activate the metaphor of spinning for the creation of poetry within a programmatic context. This instance is clearly an allusion to Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue, though Virgil redeploys the phrase to suit his own poetic needs, which embrace, unlike Callimachus, a discussion of poetic genre. With this in mind, it seems very likely that Ovid might be alluding simultaneously to Virgil and Callimachus, and that like Virgil, Ovid may use *deducite carmen* for purposes other than Virgil's or Callimachus'.

Ovid's allusions to these particular poetic predecessors as well as the programmatic context of *perpetuum*, *deducere*, and *carmen* serves to reinforce the allusions to these two programmatic sections. Ovid chose to use a form of *deducere* together with *carmen*, which secures this phrase as an allusion to the *Aetia* as well as to Virgil's *Eclogue* and serves a double purpose within his proem: it may mean "lead down" and "spin out" implying that like Callimachus' *Aetia*, he wishes the gods to help him create a finely spun, or finely woven poem. It has already been established that Ovid could have chosen to read Callimachus' διηνεκές as temporal continuity. However, Ovid would have known its ambiguous effect, especially when placed next to *deducite*,

the Latin translation of Callimachus' λεπταλεήν. Thus Ovid playfully indicates that his poem in some respect might be, on the other hand, both Callimachean and un-Callimachean. In this repositioning of loaded terminology within a programmatic proem he follows Virgil's lead, who himself redeploys terminology to suit his own purposes.[112]

What then is the final effect of Ovid's allusions to Virgil and Callimachus? One possible reading is that like his predecessors he is fully aware of the poetic past and while he pays his compliments and signals his allegiances, i.e. the *quale* of his poem, he makes clear that he, as his poetic predecessors have done, has created something uniquely Ovidian—both Virgilian and un-Virgilian, Callimachean and un-Callimachean.

The allusions Ovid wove into the *Metamorphoses's* proem also have interesting implications for our understanding of this poem's genre. With the end of the second verse and the poem's hexametric meter established, the well-read ancient reader would have realized that he was beginning an epic poem; Ovid's choice of hexameter would have given the reader partial signals regarding the poem's genre. The reader would then have thought of other Latin epics such as Ennius's historical *Annales*, the epic poems commissioned by republican statesmen to commemorate their deeds, but most especially Virgil's *Aeneid*, already the epitome of Latin epic poetry in Ovid's day. Virgil had revolutionized Latin epic by combining the legendary with the historical in such a way that his accomplishment was seemingly unsurpassable. Once the reader finishes the *Metamorphoses*, he realizes that this is precisely what Ovid does in his epic. In the proem Ovid hints at this: *primaque ab origine mundi / ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen* (*Met.* 1.3-4).[113] The form the proem takes, that of an invocation, reinforces the notion that the reader is beginning an epic poem. But the poet inserted signals that indicate that this epic, though it may be compared to Virgil's, will be different. The reader may be impressed by the *nova* of the first verse, which as has been pointed out, may be read to mean

[112] Quite aside from the issue of allusion, Tarrant (2002), 22 writes that Virgil responds to the challenge of writing a Callimachean epic poem (which he succeeded in doing) by "reconciling the competing claims in an entirely different way, by weaving hundreds of discrete episodes into a thematically and chronologically ordered whole". See also Wheeler (1999), 8-30.

[113] Though Livius Andronicus had translated the *Odyssey* into native Saturnians, and Naevius had written *Bellum Poenicum* in the same verse, Ennius wrote his epic in hexameters. Thus the hexameters of the *Aeneid* constituted a signal in Latin (as it was in Greek) for epic poetry. See Hardie (1998), 261.

"my inspiration carries (me) on to new things".[114] This in turn may be interpreted to be the poet's claim of originality or as his inspiration to try a new type of writing. Though the reader discovers in the second verse that *nova* modifies *corpora*, these interpretations still remain in the mind. The reader then encounters the plural *di* the poet calls upon to aid him in his composition; it was indeed new for a poet to call not upon the Muses or one god, but the gods.[115] The allusions of the programmatic terminology of the fourth and final verse of the proem then give generic signals at variance with the epic flavor established in the first three lines; *deducite carmen* refers both to Virgil's pastoral and hexametric *Eclogue* 6, and Callimachus' *Aetia*, an epic elegiac work discussing causes and origins. At the same time *perpetuum*, which may be interpreted temporally, alludes to διηνεκές, which the reader may also associate with a particular poetic style connected to poetry of great length. Furthermore, one must take the phrase *ab origine mundi / ad mea tempora* into account. Obviously this is not a translation of, but an expansion upon and distinction from Callimachus' διηνεκές, which means "continuous" in the sense of uninterrupted. From this perspective, then, Ovid clearly indicates in the proem that this poem is an epic that is distinct from Callimachus' elegy, and that draws from many genres.

When viewed in Contean terms, the allusions of the *Metamorphoses*' *perpetuum deducite carmen* at first appear to be integrative; the Virgilian and Callimachean poetic voices appear to merge into Ovid's own. Once the reader identifies the allusions, not only to Callimachus, but to Virgil, these terms no longer can be seen as producing one harmonious "voice" within Ovid's text. With the syntactically and visually joined allusions Ovid embraces both the "finely-spun Muse (poem)," advocated by Callimachus and Virgil, and "a poem with all the details". The conflict inherent in these allusions makes it impossible for them to seamlessly coexist in the proem. This juxtaposition, a startling acceptance of the "un-Callimachean" and the "Callimachean" (as well as the "Virgilian" and "un-Virgilian"), then becomes a face-to-face dialogue of texts that ultimately calls attention, in a very self-conscious way, to the allusion itself and the literary nature of the proem.[116]

---

[114] Kenney (1976), 46.
[115] Kenney (1976), 47.
[116] This is not the first time that Ovid chose to begin in a manner that demands the reader's attention; cf. *Amores* 1.1.

This chapter has focused on lexical allusions made via programmatic terminology of the *Aetia* prologue and the proem of the *Metamorphoses*. From this examination we can make a few broad statements. The fact that Callimachus uses an integrative allusion in the prologue of his *Aetia* is at least partially indicative of his poetic technique for this poem as a whole. He would seem to suggest from the outset that though his poem is of a different sort, he will integrate pieces of his poetic heritage into his creation. Ovid indicates that he will more openly reflect upon and incorporate his poetic predecessors into his poem, but that the reader should expect ambiguities and contradictions as he weaves them all into his creation.

CHAPTER THREE

BROADENING THE SCOPE: MARKING THE ALLUSION AND REITERATIVE INTEGRATIVE AND REFLECTIVE ALLUSION

> Non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi,
> hoc animo ut vellet agnosci.
>
> Not for the sake of stealing, but of open borrowing,
> for the purpose of having it recognized.
> (Seneca the Elder, *Suasoriae* 3.7)

Introduction

The previous chapter's examination of particular programmatic terminology of Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue and of Ovid's proem to the *Metamorphoses* revealed that both poets use allusions in order to express that poetic style, not poetic genre, was of great importance to their poems. We also saw that these programmatic allusions were constructed differently. The integrative allusions of Callimachus' introduction suggest that the poet integrates poetic tradition into his *Aetia*, and that this mode of allusion is at least partially indicative of his allusive style. Ovid's use of reflective allusion indicates that he reflects poetic tradition in his *Metamorphoses*. These introductory statements couched in allusions prompt the reader to ask whether these modes of allusion are indicative of their poetic style as a whole, or whether both poets incorporated other allusive types into their poetry. This chapter expands the investigation of allusive technique to longer portions of the poets' work and, in the case of Callimachus, to another generic form, in an attempt to answer these questions.

Within the context of two mythological tales, the stories of Tiresias and Actaeon, that both appear in Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 and Book 3 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, this chapter explores other modes of allusion used by these poets. In this chapter we move beyond localized lexical allusions to multiple lexical allusions within single stories. In order to

clarify from which sources Callimachus and Ovid drew, and to aid in the analysis of allusions to these sources, first we will attempt to identify on whom the poets relied for their particular versions of the tales. We will examine how Callimachus and Ovid mark, or "signpost," portions of these stories so that the reader may identify allusive sections more readily. Then we will explore how both poets allude to other writers within their stories. Finally, we will see that the definition of allusion may be expanded to include other poetic techniques, such as the manipulation of the stories that surround lexical allusions.

An Overview of Callimachus' Lavacrum Palladis

With the fifth *Hymn* Callimachus plunges the reader into the middle of a celebration of Athena, or more precisely, the ritual cleansing of the Palladion in Argos. The voice of the hymn, which addresses the participants of this festival, and the reader as well, is presumably that of a priestess or female official.[1] The first thirty-two lines constitute the speaker's address to the participants of the festival. She begins with a preliminary invocation (verses 1-4); Athena's first attribute: the care of her horses, with a reference to the Gigantomachia (verses 5-12); she summons the celebrants once more (verses 13-17); Athena's second attribute: her beauty with a reference to the Judgment of Paris (verses 18-28); she then gives final instructions to the celebrants. The next portion of the hymn is directed toward Athena herself. There is a preliminary invocation (verses 33-34); the Shield of Diomedes and its connection to the ceremony (verses 35-42); a second invocation (verses 43-44); a warning to the profane (verses 45-54); a third invocation and transition to a narrative (verses 55-56). The hymn concludes with final instructions to the festival's celebrants and with greetings to the goddess herself (verses 137-42).[2] Within this mimetic frame Callimachus set his versions of the tales of Tiresias's blinding by Athena (verses 51-

[1] At no point does the poet identify the speaker/narrator, though in his commentary of *Hymn* 5 Bulloch refers to the hymn's narrator as "the speaker" (1985), 3 as does Depew (1994), 410. The speaker is presumed to be female given that this ceremony celebrating Athena was only for women. For a deeper understanding of the relationship of mimesis and the genre of Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 see Depew (1993), 57-77.

[2] The division of Callimachus' fifth *Hymn* is based upon that of Bulloch (1985), 109. For another view on Callimachus' fifth *Hymn* see McKay (1962b).

106, 119-131) and Artemis's punishment of Actaeon (verses 107-118).[3] The cautionary story of the blinding of Tiresias begins at verse 57. The hymn's speaker, by way of entertaining the festival participants and, more importantly, to illustrate the necessity of males avoiding the sight of the goddess's image (verses 51-52), tells the tale of Tiresias inadvertently catching sight of Athena while bathing with Chariclo, her favorite and the mother of Tiresias. Athena blinds her favorite's son and, to justify her actions and counter Chariclo's laments, she delivers a *consolatio* in which the goddess gives as an exemplum the future death of Actaeon by Artemis, after the young favorite of that goddess unwittingly sees the goddess while bathing. Athena completes her consolation of Chariclo by promising Tiresias the gifts of prophecy and of understanding the speech of birds. She gives him a staff with which he can walk as if sighted, and promises that once dead Tiresias shall walk among the dead with understanding. Callimachus has ingeniously inserted into the heart of his hymn to Athena two more or less parallel stories.

True to Callimachus' reputation this *Lavacrum Palladis* is typically "Hellenistic." That is to say, the conventional poetic form, in this case that of a hymn, becomes a vehicle for something different.[4] Here the poet adheres to the basic purpose of the ancient hymn: to praise a divinity using a story to illustrate the divinity's powers. Yet Callimachus achieves this in a rather indirect way.[5] First, the hymn is placed within a mimetic frame in which a "participant" of an Argive festival honoring Athena relates an unusual version of the blinding of Tiresias. Within this tale the goddess herself tells the tale of Artemis' future punishment of Actaeon as a sort of *consolatio* directed not at Tiresias, but at his mother, Chariclo. Later we will return to the somewhat complex and playful framework of *Hymn* 5, which reveals a good deal

[3] Following Bulloch (1989), 24 I define "mimetic" as a narrative (prose or poetry) which "purports to be a verbatim report of words spoken by characters involved in a particular scene". Callimachus wrote three "mimetic" hymns, *Hymn* 2, *Hymn* 5, and *Hymn* 6. Because the invocation and epilogue portions of these hymns, which "frame" the tales the hymns' "speakers" relate to honor the god (among other things), are the primary means by which the poet creates a "mimetic" poem, I shall call them "mimetic frames."

[4] For this definition of the term of "Hellenistic" see Bulloch (1989), 11.

[5] For an excellent examination of Callimachus' fifth *Hymn* see Bulloch (1985). For a discussion of the style of all of Callimachus' *Hymns* and relevant bibliography see Haslam (1993), 111-125.

about Callimachus poetic methodology. Let us now turn to these two rather unusual, unexpected stories and the poet's possible sources.

The Sources for Callimachus' Tiresias and Actaeon

The version of Tiresias' blinding set forth in this hymn is unusual, and the issue on whom Callimachus relied, and thus to whom he might be alluding, is somewhat vexed. The more frequently found aetiology of Tiresias' blinding occurs first in extant literature in Hesiod's *Melampodia* Fr. 275. In this version Zeus and Hera quarrel about whether man or woman derives more pleasure from sexual intercourse and turn to the mortal Tiresias, because he himself had been both male and female, to act as an arbitrator. Tiresias claims that woman receives nine times more pleasure, which prompts the Queen of the Gods to blind him. Taking pity on him, Zeus then compensates him for his blindness, giving him the gifts of prophecy and longevity.[6] As Hesiodic as Callimachus' poetry is often thought to be, this is not the version of the famous seer's blinding set forth in the fifth *Hymn.*[7] Whose account, then, was Callimachus' source?

Wyss, followed later by Bulloch, suggested that the *Argolica*, a prose treatise of at least three books, written in the Doric dialect and covering matters of myth and cult, written by Agias and later revised and supplemented by Dercylus, was the primary source of the Tiresias of *Hymn* 5.[8] Callimachus is believed to have used the *Argolica* as a source for his *Aetia* in the episodes dealing with the Graces (Frr. 3-7), Linus and Coroebus (Frr. 26-31), and the Fountains of Argos (Frr. 65-66), and Wyss and Bulloch believe it is a reasonable assumption that this too was a source for the *Lavacrum Palladis.*[9] Bulloch supports Wyss' earlier suggestion by referring to Callimachus' μῦθος δ' οὐκ

[6] This version is found later in Dicaearchus (Fr. 37 Wehrli); Clearchus (ap. Phlegon, *Mir.* 4 in Jacoby, *FGrHist* 2B257F36); Apollodorus 3.6.7; and Ovid *Met.* 3.316ff., to whose account we will return; Hyginus *Fab.* 75. For a summary of various myths about Tiresias see Buxton (1980), 22-37, esp. 28 and Gantz (1993), 528-530.

[7] For the influence of Hesiod's poetry upon that of Callimachus see especially Reinsch-Werner (1976).

[8] Wyss (1936), 88 n.15; Bulloch (1985), 16-17. For extant fragments of the *Argolica* see Jacoby, *FGrHist* 3b 305 (pp.7-10 and 757), and for discussion of these fragments, *FGrHist* 3b (*Kommentar*) pp. 17-24 and 3b (*Noten*) pp. 10-13.

[9] See the *Florentine Scholium* 35-36 (Pfeiffer (1949-1953), 13); the Diegesis in *P.Oxy.* 2263 Fr. I col. II 6-8 (Pfeiffer (1949-1953), 108; the commentary to Antimachus Fr. 179, in A. Vogliano (1937), no. 16 col. II 14-16; and Pfeiffer (1985), 68-69.

ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων, “The story is not mine, but others” (verse 56), which is uttered by the festival participant/narrator before she turns to the cautionary tale of Tiresias and Athena. Because the singular *ἑτέρου* is metrically also possible, Bulloch finds that the plural form, *ἑτέρων*, indicates that Agias' and Dercylus' work was the source of Callimachus' Tiresias. Furthermore, he suggests that this Tiresias myth was the cult myth associated with the Argive festival; thus the *Argolica* seems Callimachus' most likely source.[10] Though an interesting theory, it is based on two rather tenuous threads of evidence: the word *ἑτέρων*, which might well refer to sources in addition to the *Argolica*, and the aetiological focus of other cultic myths, a focus which Callimachus' account of Tiresias does not possess.

Lacy reviews the arguments of other scholars who believe that Callimachus invented the accounts of both Tiresias and Actaeon (on whose story we will concentrate below), portraying Athena, Chariclo, and Tiresias as hunters and forcing Actaeon to see Artemis while bathing.[11] However, it is highly unlikely that the poet simply fabricated the story. This theory runs counter to what is known about Callimachus' poetic style; he is far more likely to have used an erudite source.[12]

Only one author before Callimachus is known to have given the account involving Athena, the fifth-century mythographer Pherecydes, who is preserved in two sources, Apollodorus 3.6.7 and Schol. T *Od.* 10.493.[13] Apollodorus records (3.6.7):[14]

> *ἦν δὲ παρὰ Θηβαίοις μάντις Τειρεσίας Εὐήρους καὶ Χαρικλοῦς νύμφης, ἀπὸ γένους Οὐδαίου τοῦ Σπαρτοῦ, γενόμενος τυφλὸς τὰς ὁράσεις. οὗ περὶ τῆς πηρώσεως καὶ τῆς μαντικῆς λέγονται λόγοι διάφοροι. ἄλλοι μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ θεῶν φασι τυφλωθῆναι, ὅτι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἃ κρύπτειν ἤθελον ἐμήνυε, Φερεκύδης δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀθηνᾶς αὐτὸν τυφλωθῆναι· οὖσαν γὰρ τὴν Χαρικλὼ προσφιλῆ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ...γυμνὴν ἐπὶ πάντα ἰδεῖν, τὴν δὲ ταῖς χερσὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καταλαβομένην πηρὸν ποιῆσαι, Χαρικλοῦς δὲ δεομένης ἀποκαταστῆσαι πάλιν τὰς ὁράσεις, μὴ δυναμένην τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, τὰς ἀκοὰς διακαθάρασαν πᾶσαν ὀρνίθων φωνὴν ποιῆσαι συνεῖναι, καὶ σκῆπτρον αὐτῷ δωρήσασθαι κράνειον, ὃ φέρων ὁμοίως τοῖς βλέπουσιν ἐβάδιζεν.*

---

[10] See Bulloch (1985), 17-25.

[11] Most notably Kleinknecht (1936), 336-9. Lacy (1990), 29 summarizes this discussion.

[12] As Haslam (1993), 123 and Depew (1994), 410-426 have pointed out.

[13] These texts may also be found in Jacoby *FGrHist* I 3F92.

[14] Translation of Apollodorus is that of J.G. Frazer (1956) vol. 2.

> Now there was among the Thebans a soothsayer, Tiresias, son of Everes and a nymph Chariclo, of the family of Udaeus, the Spartan, and he had lost the sight of his eyes. Different stories are told about his blindness and his power of soothsaying. For some say that he was blinded by the gods because he revealed their secrets to men. But Pherecydes says that he was blinded by Athena; for Clariclo was dear to Athena………..and Tiresias saw the goddess stark naked, and she covered his eyes with her hands, and so rendered him sightless. And when Chariclo asked her to restore his sight, she could not do so, but by cleansing his ears she caused him to understand every note of birds; and she gave him a staff of cornel wood, with which he walked like those who see.

Though both Apollodorus and the scholia are somewhat lacunose, they are complete enough to show that Pherecydes' account is very similar to that of Callimachus. In fact, most modern scholars have assumed that this mythographer was Callimachus' source for the unusual version of Tiresias' blinding.[15] More recently Haslam and Depew have further refined this view.[16] Haslam maintains that the *Argolica* of Agias and Dercylus was the source for the ritual bathing of the *statue* of Athena in the river Inachus,[17] but that Pherecydes was his source for the bath of the goddess herself, which led to the blindness and prophetic powers of Tiresias; thus in the *Lavacrum Palladis* Callimachus formulated a link between two very different baths of Athena. Depew has argued convincingly that not only is the fifth *Hymn*'s version of the blinding of Tiresias derived from Pherecydes' account, but that Athena's extended consolation and the goddess' reference to Actaeon's crime are based upon a version of Actaeon's demise found in *POxy* 2509. In this fragment, attributed to the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*,[18] Athena, acting on behalf of her father Zeus, delivers a *conso-*

---

[15] Roscher (1884-1937), 183 believed that this version of the blinding of Tiresias is the simpler, older form of the myth. Wilamowitz (1924), 23-24 believed that in the fifth *Hymn* Athena is characterized with features more usually found connected to Artemis, and therefore asserts that Pherecydes invented this version of the punishment of Tiresias, which parallels the punishment of Actaeon inflicted by Artemis. See also Cahen (1929), 238-239 and Radermacher (1938), 51, who tentatively follow Wilamowitz' lead.

[16] Haslam (1993), 123-125. and Depew (1994), 410-426.

[17] In his commentary Bulloch (1985), 16-25 proposes that the *Argolica* included the blinding of Tiresias by Athena and was the primary source for much of the fifth *Hymn*. This seems unlikely because, as Haslam (1993), 124 points out, the Callimachean blinding of Tiresias occurs on Helicon, not in the Argolid, and the *Argolica* was a collection of aetiological tales, most probably not mythological exempla.

[18] For the papyrus fragment *POxy* 2509, which some are reluctant to believe belongs to the *Catalogue of Women*, see E. Lobel (1964), 4-7. See also Depew (1994), 413, n. 24.

latio to Actaeon's tutor, Chiron, and the centaur's wife, Chariclo. In essence, then, in his version of the fate of Tiresias Callimachus has *combined* three traditions: Athena's bath with Chariclo and Tiresias' intrusion upon it, Artemis' bath and Actaeon's intrusion upon it; and Athena's *consolatio* for Actaeon's death. If we can be reasonably certain that Pherecydes was Callimachus' principal source for his unusual version of Tiresias' blinding, then upon whom did he rely for his version of the crime and punishment of Actaeon?

Where there is a relative plentitude of sources for Callimachus' account of Tiresias' fate, we are at a loss in the detection of possible sources for his Actaeon story.[19] In all accounts of Actaeon's death the nature of his punishment does not vary: he is transformed into a stag and torn apart by his own dogs. The extant literature, however, offers different versions of his crime. In archaic Greek literature he is punished for his love of his aunt Semele, who is Zeus' intended and the future mother of Dionysus.[20] Not until Euripides' *Bacchae* does Actaeon boast that his hunting skills are superior to those of Artemis (Euripides' *Bacchae* 337-341), and Callimachus' Actaeon is the first extant Actaeon to be punished for intruding on Artemis while bathing.[21] Finally, the relatively late Diodorus Siculus (to at least 21 B.C.) records that when Actaeon had dedicated the spoils of a hunt to Artemis he tried to rape her in her own sanctuary; thus his crime was lust for the goddess herself.[22]

---

[19] It seems probable that the poet knew various versions of the Actaeon story given that he was the son of Aristaeus, who in turn was the son of Apollo and Cyrene, Cyrene being a nymph and founding deity of the poet's home city. Moreover, Callimachus wrote a treatise on nymphs. See Pfeiffer (1949-1953), 328.

[20] Sources of this crime from the Archaic Period to the Persian War: Hesiod Fr. 271A, in West (1985), 87-88, 178; Stesichorus *PMG* 236; Acusilaus *PMG* 47-58, 375-386.

[21] *Lavacrum Palladis* 113-14; Though Callimachus' Actaeon is the first in extant literature to be punished for this particular crime, Apollodorus writes (3.4.4): Αὐτονόης δὲ καὶ Ἀρισταίου παῖς Ἀκταίων ἐγένετο, ὃς τραφεὶς παρὰ Χείρωνι κυνηγὸς ἐδιδάχθη, καὶ ἔπειτα ὕστερον ἐν τῷ Κιθαιρῶνι κατεβρώθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων κυνῶν. καὶ τοῦτον ἐτελεύτησε τὸν τρόπον, ὡς μὲν Ἀκουσίλαος λέγει, μηνίσαντος τοῦ Διὸς ὅτι ἐμνηστεύσατο Σεμέλην, ὡς δὲ οἱ πλείονες, ὅτι τὴν Ἄρτεμιν λουομένην εἶδε. ("Autonoe and Aristaeus had a son Actaeon, who was bred by Chiron to be a hunter and then afterwards was devoured on Cithaeron by his own dogs. He perished in this way, according to Acusilaus, because Zeus was angry at him for wooing Semele. But according to the more general opinion, it was because he saw Artemis bathing".)

[22] Diodorus 4.81.4.

With this evidence at hand, some scholars believe that Callimachus rewrote the story of Actaeon to parallel that of Tiresias,[23] and one has suggested that a lost tragedy or tragedies were Callimachus' inspiration.[24] Others have argued that the Tiresias story was an extension of the Actaeon myth,[25] while still others believe that the poet has recast both stories, making Athena, Chariclo, and Tiresias hunters and Actaeon, the hunter devoted to Artemis, see the goddess while bathing.[26] These views, however, disregard a few aspects of the poet's hymn. Firstly, Callimachus' Tiresias-Athena encounter was probably not based on the Actaeon-Artemis episode since the bath of Artemis is not extant before the *Fifth Hymn* itself. Secondly, perhaps as important is one of the most essential characteristics of Hellenistic poetry: its antiquarian nature, its love of sources. Callimachus would have preferred to use another's story rather than completely invent his own.[27] Moreover, as Blome has pointed out, the brevity of the Callimachus' Actaeon exemplum is incompatible with the creation of a new version.[28] Finally, Callimachus himself tells the reader that the story is not his own creation when he writes *μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων*, "The story is not mine, but others" (verse 56). The logical conclusion is that the poet who sings of nothing unattested did not invent his version of the crime of Actaeon, but he relied upon a source lost to us but available to himself, perhaps one of the *οἱ πλείονες* mentioned by Apollodorus (4.4.4).[29]

---

[23] Malten (1911), 19, 34; Preller and Robert (1920), 128 and n. 3; Kleinknecht (1936), 336.

[24] Lacy (1990), 42.

[25] Wilamowitz (1924), 23; Cahen (1929), 232; Radermacher (1938), 51.

[26] McKay (1962b), 45; Schlam (1984), 96.

[27] Castiglioni (1913), 63-69; Haslam (1993), 123-124, "...the story self-evidently belonged to Actaeon and Artemis before it was transferred to Teiresias and Athena. A nymph-attended goddess, bathing in a mountain spring, disturbed by a young hunter: roles custom-made for Artemis and Actaeon, and creakingly uncomfortable for Athena and Teiresias." This point is also made by Wilamowitz (1924), 23.

[28] Blome (1977), 43; Haslam (1993), 12. Pausanius (X 31.4) also comments on mythological exempla with reference to a myth in one of Phrynichus's tragedies, "...but Phrynichus, as we see, has not worked out the story in detail as an author would do with a creation of his own: he has merely touched on it as a story famous all over Greece." In Homer, however, the creation of paradigmatic myths is well documented, see Willcock (1964), 144-154.

[29] For Apollodorus's text see pp. 76-77.

An Overview of Ovid's Tiresias and Actaeon

In only 23 verses in the center of Book 3 (verses 316-338) of the *Metamorphoses* Ovid recounts his version of the blinding of Tiresias. In a story that serves as a bridge between the tale of Jupiter, Semele, the birth of their son Dionysus and that of Narcissus and Echo (Tiresias being the seer who predicted the demise of Narcissus), he writes that, shortly after the death of Semele and the birth of Dionysus, Jupiter and Juno once had a disagreement about the amount of pleasure males and females derive from sexual intercourse; Jupiter asserted that females experience more pleasure, while Juno denied this (verses 318-322). The King and Queen of the Olympians then consulted Tiresias, who had had the unique experience of being both male and female (verses 322-323). Ovid then tells how this came about (verses 322-331). One day while walking Tiresias encountered two copulating snakes that he struck with his staff. He was then transformed into a female and in the eighth year of womanhood she once again saw the same serpents, which she struck again and was subsequently returned to the state of a man. After being chosen as arbitrator of the Olympian dispute, he gave his verdict that women do, in fact, derive more pleasure than men from the sexual act (verses 332-333). In a rage, Juno blinded Tiresias and, because a god cannot reverse the act of another divinity, as compensation Jupiter granted him the power of prophecy (verses 333-338).

Ovid's account of Actaeon's crime and punishment occurs near the beginning of Book 3 and is much longer than either his own tale of Tiresias or Callimachus' Actaeon.[30] This tale consists of 116 verses and begins with a reference to Actaeon's grandfather, Cadmus, whose story opens the book, with a reference to the young man's fate, as well as a pronouncement that it was fate that brought about his death, not a crime (*at bene si quaeras, fortunae crimen in illo, / non scelus invenies; quod enim scelus error habebat*?). The poet then sets the idyllic yet ominous scene of the event: at midday Actaeon and his companions stop hunting for the day and Actaeon suggests resuming their activities the following day (verses 143-154). The area of the event is mentioned, Gargaphia, as well as a specific spot sacred to Diana, a cave and cool pool of water, which is frequented by the goddess and her nymphs (verses 155-164). In the detailed passage that follows, the poet de-

[30] For a general overview of the contents of this book of the *Metamorphoses* see von Albrecht (2003), 136-137.

scribes the bathing routine of the goddess and the tasks each of her attendant nymphs performs (verses 155-172). With the scene set, the next section of the episode relates Actaeon stumbling onto Diana and her nymphs while bathing, the goddess' reaction, her threat of punishment, Actaeon's transformation into a stag, and the young man's reaction to this punishment (verses 173-205). After this pitiful description of the young Actaeon, Ovid immediately sets upon the catalogue of Actaeon's hunting dogs, which will dismember their transformed master (verses 206-225), and he concludes the episode with the gruesomely detailed mutilation of Actaeon by these dogs (verses 225-252).

The Sources for Ovid's Tiresias and Actaeon

As we have seen, the Callimachean rendering of the blinding of Tiresias that appears in *Hymn* 5 is exceptional. The more common story of Tiresias' fate occurs first in extant literature in Hesiod's *Melampodia* Fr. 275,[31] and it is this version that most probably influenced Ovid's brief account of Tiresias' blinding. As outlined above, this Hesiodic narrative includes the Olympian quarrel over the amount of pleasure men and women receive from love-making, the mortal Tiresias is chosen as arbitrator due to his past experience as both man and woman (a transformation which was brought about by Tiresias wounding two copulating snakes), the blinding of Tiresias because his answer displeases Juno (Hera), and the compensation of his blindness by Jupiter (Zeus).[32] Ovid does, however, alter the Hesiodic version in a few details. The Tiresias of Hesiod wounds the two snakes, *Ἡσίοδος δέ φησιν ὅτι θεασάμενος περὶ Κυλλήνην ὄφεις συνουσιάζοντας καὶ τούτους τρώσας ἐγένετο ἐξ ἀνδρὸς γυνή*, ("and Hesiod says that he beheld two snakes copulating on Cyllene, and that having wounded them he was turned from a man into a woman"; Apollodorus 3.6.7) while the Ovidian Tiresias merely strikes them, *nam duo magnorum viridi coeuntia silva / corpora serpentum baculi violaverat ictu / deque viro factus,*

[31] This may also be found in Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* 3.6.7; cf. *Schol. Hom.* K 494 (ii.475 Dindorf); Eustath. *Schol. Hom.* k 494, p. 1665, 43-44. The Hesiodic story is also told by Phlegon, *Mirabilia* 4; Tzetzes *Schol. On Lycophron* 683; Antoninus Liberalis *Met.* 17; Hyginus *Fab.* 75; Lactantius Placidus on Statius *Theb.* 2.95; Fulgentius, *Mytholog. 2.8*; *Scriptores rerum mythicarum Latini*, ed. G.H. Bode, vol. I: 5, 104, 169.

[32] Ovid, like Hesiod, does not make mention of Tiresias' mother, Chariclo, who is a central figure in Callimachus' account; another Chariclo (ostensibly unrelated to Tiresias) appears as the wife of Chiron and mother of the *prophetess* Ocyrhoe at *Met.* 2.636.

mirabile, femina septem / egerat autumnos ("for he had struck with a blow of his staff the bodies of two huge serpents intertwining themselves in the depths of the green wood; and from being a man he was miraculously changed into a woman, and had lived as such for seven years"; *Met.* 3.324-327). The fragment places the setting of Tiresias' gender transformation on Cyllene (Fr. 275.2), whereas Ovid does not name a particular place. The Ovidian Tiresias lives as a woman for seven years and in the eighth year she sees the same snakes once more, strikes them, and is transformed back into a male, while the Tiresias of Hesiod leaves the time-period lived as a woman undefined. The Hesiodic Tiresias fixes the amount of pleasure derived by males and females as a ratio (woman receiving 9 parts of 10, man the remaining 1; Fr. 275.11-12) while Ovid's Tiresias simply confirms Jupiter's assertion that women receive more pleasure from love-making (*Met.* 3. 333). Finally, and in compensation for Hera's punishment, the Hesiodic Zeus bestows upon Tiresias the gift of soothsaying (Fr. 275.9) and the fragment states that he lived to a great age (Fr. 275.13), whereas Ovid's Jupiter grants Tiresias only the power to know the future (*Met.* 3. 338).

We have already observed that in all versions of Actaeon's tale his punishment does not differ, but the tradition hands down various crimes: Actaeon desires his aunt Semele and therefore Zeus punishes him;[33] Actaeon boasts that he was a better hunter than Artemis herself and is accordingly punished for his hubris (Euripides' *Ba.* 337-341); Actaeon desires the goddess herself and attempts to marry her at her own sanctuary[34]; finally there is the version we encounter in Callimachus' fifth *Hymn* and in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Actaeon is punished for inadvertently intruding upon Artemis while bathing. It seems most probable that Ovid relied upon Callimachus account and greatly expanded upon it; Ovid's account extends to 116 verses while Callimachus' comprises only twelve lines, of which seven outline the young man's crime and punishment (verses 111-116). What were the Latin poet's sources for his extended version?

Ovid's particular version of Actaeon's demise is not extant before Callimachus' fifth *Hymn*, which would seem to suggest that this is Ovid's primary source for his own narrative and that there is a relationship between the two worth examining. However, Apollodorus' *Biblio-*

---

[33] Hesiod Fr. 271A, in West (1985), 87-88, 178; Stesichorus *PMG* 236; Acusilaus *PMG* 47-58, 375-386

[34] Diodorus 4.81.4.

theca, the text of which can be dated to either the first or second century A.D., tells us that *others* recount the "Callimachean" version.[35] At this point we must be content to say that one source was clearly Callimachus' *Lavacrum Palladis*, and surely Ovid, like Callimachus, was familiar with and perhaps influenced by Pherecydes' account, which is preserved for us now in Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*.[36] It is likewise clear that the innocence of Ovid's Actaeon was inspired as well by Callimachus' treatment of Tiresias and perhaps by some of the sources mentioned in the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus, for other accounts of the young man's crime prior to and post-dating Ovid's emphasize Actaeon's inappropriate lust and, therefore, his culpability.[37] One other notably distinct addition Ovid made to the factual framework handed down to him is the famous *Hundekatalog* (verses 206-225). Prior to the *Metamorphoses* the only extant "catalogue of dogs" occurs in some manuscripts of Apollodorus,[38] where the names of the dogs have been added.[39] Such a list also appears in a fragment of Aeschylus (Fr. 423a Radt), as well as Hyginus's *Fabulae* (181), but there is considerable difference of names attributed to the dogs in these sources. We are left, then, to conclude that Ovid's catalogue of hounds was probably inspired by an unknown source (or sources), which could also be the source for other details.

To summarize, for his own account of Tiresias' blinding, Ovid probably relied upon Hesiod's account, which follows the more common account, though he does make a few alterations. That Ovid did not use Callimachus or Callimachus' source as his own source in this instance may have seemed odd to his audience, especially since, as we have seen, he relied upon Callimachus' account of Actaeon. However,

[35] See Apollodorus 3.6.7, text on pp. 76-77, and *OCD* (1996), 124 for dating Apollodorus.

[36] See pp. 76-77, as well as Otis (1966), 396, and Bömer (1968), 487.

[37] E.g. Hesiod Fr. 271A; Stesichorus *PMG* 236; Acusilaus *PMG* 47-58, 375-386; Diodorus 4..81.4; Hyginus' *Fabulae* of the second century A.D. in which Actaeon...*Dianam lavantem speculatus est et eam violare voluit* (180); and Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* of c. fifth century A.D. in which Actaeon is described as a lusty *voyeur* θηητὴρ...ἀκόρητος (5.305ff.); Bömer (1968), 487, writes: "Aktaion ist in der älteren Sage in erster Linie als ὑβριστής bekannt. Ovid hat die Sage dadurch bedeutsam umgestaltet, dass er alle Schuld von Actaeon genommen hat". Otis (1966), 398, believes that the poet "took the innocence of the victim from Callimachus".

[38] Apollodorus 3.4.5-6, MSS E and S excepted.

[39] See Bömer (1968), 503-511 and Frazer (1961), 322 n. 4 who encloses the catalogue of Actaeon's dogs within brackets because he believes it to be interpolated from another source.

as we shall see, there are other ways in which a poet may indicate his dependence on another's work.

Marking the Text

It bears repeating that because so much ancient literature has not survived, it is impossible to recognize many allusions Callimachus and Ovid inserted into their poetry. In the case of the stories discussed here, in particular, other versions survive only in name while the majority perished.[40] Yet from the paltry information that does exist much can be revealed concerning the allusive nature of the stories of Tiresias and Actaeon.

In the previous chapter we saw that the prologues of poems in antiquity were the sites where poets usually signal their audience or reader the *quid* and the *quale* of their poems via allusions, and it would seem that the audience or reader, no matter how sophisticated, expected some indication of content and poetic technique at the poem's inception.[41] However, once one entered the body of a poem, particularly a longer poem, the poet needed some device other than the audience's or reader's expectation to signal that a reference was being made; if the reference went unnoticed, the poet ran the risk of being partially misunderstood. One way in which poets in antiquity signaled that an allusion was being made at a given point was by creating allusions to carry a sort of built-in commentary, or a kind of reflexive annotation.[42] This poetic technique corresponds to Ross' "Alexandrian footnote," which is the use of general reference to tradition and report (i.e. *ferunt, dicitur*, *fama est*) to signal that an allusion is being made.[43] Hinds' treatment of the first verses of Catullus' *c.* 64, which describe the ship Argo, serves as a good example of this technique (Cat. *c.* 64.1-2):[44]

> Peliaco quondam prognatae vertice pinus
> *dicuntur* liquidas Neptuni nasse per undas

[40] For an account of writers who used the Actaeon story in their work see Lacy (1990), 26-42 and Roscher (1884-1937), 214-217. For a list of writers who used Tiresias in their work see Roscher (1884-1937), 178-185.

[41] See Chapter Two, pp. 24-26.

[42] To use two of Hinds' terms (1998), 1.

[43] See Ross (1975), 78 who, in the context of proto-Augustan poetry, has labeled such marking as the "Alexandrian footnote". See also Hinds (1998), 1-10 who discusses this type of reference in detail.

[44] Hinds (1998), 2.

> Once pine trees, born on the peak of Pelion *are*
> *said* to have swum through Neptune's clear waves.

Thomas has shown that the entire introductory section of this poem is highly allusive. In fact, within the first eighteen verses he has discussed references to five previous versions of the story of the ship.[45] As Hinds has pointed out, the first word of the second verse, *dicuntur*, draws attention to the allusiveness of the passage.[46] *Dicuntur* refers not only to the tradition of the story, but also to Catullus' literary ancestors; thus the word functions as a sort of footnote that reveals the literary self-consciousness of the poet; the poet becomes a scholar of literature and the allusion a "learned citation" that prompts the reader to read the text more carefully.[47]

While Ross' "Alexandrian footnote" signals an allusion located outside the allusive narrative, there is another manner in which poets may signpost their texts. As Conte and Hinds, to name but two, have shown, a poet may integrate his "footnotes" or "signposts" within the text.[48] An example examined by two sholars illustrates this poetic technique. After Catullus' *c.* 64, Ovid's Ariadne faces abandonment for a second time (Ovid *Fasti* 3.471-476):

> en iterum, fluctus, similes audite querellas.
> en iterum lacrimas accipe, harena, meas.
> dicebam, *memini*, "periure et perfide Theseu!"
> ille abiit, eadem crimina Bacchus habet.
> nunc quoque "nulla viro" clamabo "femina credat";
> nomine mutato causa relata mea est.

> Waves of the sea hear again the same lamentations –
> sand of the shore, here are my tears again! I remember
> I said over and over then, "Theseus, breaker of promises
> and traitor!" and he left me. Bacchus is equally guilty
> now. I will shout again now, "Let no woman believe a
> man." My case is a repeat with only the name changed.

Ovid's footnote becomes evident against the background of Catullus c. 64 because Ovid's Ariadne "remembers" and repeats what she, in her Catullan incarnation, said (Cat. *c.* 64.130-135; 143-144):

[45] Thomas (1982), 144-164.
[46] Hinds (1998), 2.
[47] Terminology is that of Hinds (1998).
[48] Conte (1986), 57-69 and Hinds (1998), 3-16.

atque haec extremis maestam dixisse querellis,
frigidulos udo singultus ore cientem:
"sicine me patriis avectam, perfide, ab aris,
perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu?
sicine discedens neglecto numine divum
immemor a! devota domum periuria portas?
....
nunc iam nulla viro iuranti femina credat,
nulla viri speret sermones esse fideles;"

At the end of her lamentations miserably she said,
uttering her shivering sobs from a tear-stained face,
"Traitor, after taking me from my paternal altars, traitor Theseus,
have you left me thus on a deserted beach?
Is it thus, leaving, disregarding the divine will of the gods,
forgetful man, go? That you thus carry your cursed treachery home?"
....
"now let no woman believe a man when he swears, let
no woman hope that a man's words are true!"

Ovid's Ariadne remembers what she said "before" in the Catullan text, and repeats it, marking her reference with *memini*. What is especially remarkable about this Ovidian allusion is that it is integrated into the text; this is not an editorial signpost standing outside the narrative, but one woven into the narrative itself. Thus we may categorize marking of the text in general as an "Alexandrian footnote," as external, as a word or phrase serving as a footnote that occurs outside a narrative, or as internal, one that is integrated into the narrative.

Most scholars working with these types of allusive marking have stayed within the confines of Roman poetry, but given the nature of Hellenistic poetry, it should be no surprise that Callimachus too employed these techniques. In the *Lavacrum Palladis* the speaker, or rather, the poet himself, prefaces the stories of Tiresias and Actaeon with *μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων* (*Hymn* 5.56). As discussed earlier in this chapter in a somewhat different context,[49] this phrase seems to signpost the text that follows. That is, both the account of Tiresias' blinding and the brief version of Actaeon's crime and punishment, are part of the literary tradition and are perhaps allusive. In using these words Callimachus invites his audience to compare his versions of the accounts with those of others; in the case of Tiresias' blinding Pherecydes' version, and the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* for Athena's

[49] See pp. 75-76.

consolatio. It appears to be Callimachus' habit, however, to rely upon the outlines of the others' narratives, and lexical allusions are usually to another, often somewhat unexpected, author, as we shall see. At this point it is important to note that Callimachus' signpost is well integrated into the narrative action of Athena's festival and therefore is more difficult to identify immediately as a signpost.[50]

Ovid marks the allusivity of his own version of Tiresias' blinding with *forte Iovem memorant diffusum nectare curas / seposuisse graves* ("they recount that by chance relaxed with nectar, Jupiter put aside his weighty cares"; *Met.* 3.318-319) and, near the end of his tale, *gravius Saturnia iusto / nec pro materia fertur doluisse suique / iudicis aeterna damnavit lumina nocte* ("it is said that Hera was more grieved than was justified and she condemned the eyes of her judge to the eternal darkness"; *Met.* 3.333-335). Notice that the poet has woven both markers, *memorant* and *fertur*, into the story, while employing them to signpost it as being part of the tradition.

In his version of Actaeon's death Ovid concludes with *rumor...est*, which is an unmistakable external signpost pointing to general opinion regarding Artemis' punishment of Actaeon found elsewhere (*Met.* 3.251-255):

> nec nisi finita per plurima vulnera vita
> ira pharetratae fertur satiata Dianae.
> Rumor in ambiguo est: aliis violentior aequo
> visa dea est, alii laudant dignamque severa
> virginitate vocant; pars invenit utraque causas.
>
> So men say that only when his life was ended by
> innumerable wounds was the anger of quiver-
> bearing Diana appeased. General opinion was
> divided; to some the goddess seemed
> too cruel, others praised her, and declared
> her act in keeping with her strict chastity.
> Both sides could justify their views.

The passage is, once more, doubly marked with *fertur* as well as *rumor in ambiguo est*. Though both markers appear external to the narrative proper, if readers of these two accounts of Tiresias' and Actaeon's fates read the texts carefully, they will detect the poets' external and internal signposts that invite the reader to compare versions of two well-known stories to his own, and to be alert for possible allusions.

---

[50] Hinds (1998), 1-16 explores such integrated signposts.

Callimachus' Reiterative and Reflective Allusions

When the reader sets Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 alongside his sources he sees that the poet draws only the basic story line from Pherecydes. Both accounts treat the friendship of Athena and Chariclo, both Athenas present Tiresias with similar compensatory gifts, and the focus of each account is on the relationship of the goddess and Chariclo. Callimachus also makes no lexical allusions to the Hesiodic *POxy* 2509; there is only the suggestion that Callimachus drew from this source as well in the construction of the basic outline of Hesiod's Tiresias narrative. It would seem to be Callimachus' style not to allude to the obvious sources for his stories, but to use apparently unrelated accounts. As we shall see, Callimachus has constructed a series of allusions that underscore his innovative portrayal of Athena, both in the interplay of the texts involved and in the texts to which he chose to allude.

All of Callimachus' hymns read as "new" and "original", but these characteristics are not produced by their literary quality. On the contrary, the literary aspect of the hymns is not in and of itself innovative. Evidence shows that the *Homeric Hymns* are "more literary than devotional" than other early hymns.[51] Sappho employed the hymnic form for literary, not devotional, prayer, and hymns of the corpus of Theognis display clear separation of hymn and cult.[52] All now recognize that Callimachus' *Lavacrum Palladis* is not a record of a ritual nor a special composition for a ritual, but that it is intended to simulate a religious ceremony, i.e. it is mimetic.[53] The mimetic nature of this hymn, though deployed innovatively, is not a fundamental break with hymnic tradition because the essence of any hymn is mimesis: the act of performing a hymn is intended to draw the participants closer to the divinity hymned.[54] Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 is perhaps more obviously literary because of its Homeric, poetic, and archaic diction, pronounced Doricisms, and the "studied detachment" of its narrative style.[55] For example, as Bulloch points out, Callimachus introduces Chariclo's and

---

[51] Allen Halliday and Sikes (1936), lxxxvi; Furley and Bremer (2001), 41-3; and Bulloch (1985), 7.

[52] Page (1955), 16, 40; Bulloch (1985), 7.

[53] See Wilamowitz (1924), 182; Friedländer (1931), 35f; and Bulloch (1985), 4-5.

[54] See Furley and Bremer (2001), 16.

[55] Bulloch (1985), 25-26; 28; 163; 177.

Athena's friendship at verses 57-69, and again at verses 119-136, but this description of their relationship is confined to externals. Distance in the narrative is further increased by the injection of geographical information, at verses 60-64, all of which concerns Athena; this "interruption" in fact distracts from the description of their friendship. At verses 70-84, the beginning of the Tiresias section of the poem, the poet creates the atmosphere for the tragedy with a "minimum of movement and action" and Tiresias is introduced neutrally. The entire scene is not interpreted until Tiresias appears and then only very briefly. Even the blinding is described factually.[56] This narrative style stands in relief against the Homeric narrative mode that strives to draw the reader into the story. As we shall see, tension is produced when Callimachus' detached narrative style, even though or perhaps because it is mimetic, collides with allusions he makes to highly emotive Homeric *loci*. This tension makes it clear that all these allusions are reflective; once the reader identifies the texts alluded to, the texts alluded to cannot meld seamlessly into Callimachus'.

The Homeric diction of *Hymn* 5 overshadows other linguistic features, and is even more pronounced in verses 57-136, the Tiresias narrative.[57] Bulloch points out that, generally speaking, within this portion of the poem Callimachus "echoes" Homeric passages, and the contact is most often lexical.[58] The first such "contact" identified by Bulloch occurs at verses 31-32, which conclude the narrator's instructions to the celebrants and are connected to the enumeration of Athena's second attribute: her beauty. Especially *χαίταν / πέξηται λιπαρὸν... πλόκαμον* ironically recalls the scene at *Il.* 14.170-186, in which Hera prepares herself to seduce Zeus. Callimachus verses 31-32 recall especially *Il.* 14.175-178 *τῷ ῥ' ἥ γε χρόα καλὸν ἀλειψαμένη ἰδὲ <u>χαίτας</u> / <u>πεξαμένη</u>, χερσὶ <u>πλοκάμους</u> ἔπλεξε <u>φαεινοὺς</u> / καλοὺς ἀμβροσίους ἐκ κράατος ἀθανάτοιο* ("when with this she had anointed her delicate body and combed her hair, next, with her hands she arranged the shining and lovely and ambrosial curls along her immortal head"; *Il.* 14.175-178). Callimachus has adopted Homer's usage of *πέκειν / πέκεσθαι*, the only extant case prior to Callimachus where the verb means "to comb", he has cast aside its more usual meaning of "shear" or "cut", and he echoes the Homeric collocation. As Bulloch states, this allusion serves

[56] This has been pointed out by Bulloch (1985), 177-178.
[57] See Bulloch (1985), 28-29.
[58] Bulloch (1985), 29.

as a witty reminder to the celebrants, after mention of the Judgment of Paris, that Athena can be as seductive as Hera.[59] What we will discover is that this allusion begins a series of allusions to Homer that ends close to the end of the poem, at verse 129, and sets the allusive tone as reflective; as we shall see, the Homeric passages alluded to confront the Callimachean text.

To take Bulloch's point a bit further, one may add a few observations. Only at verses 51-54 does the poet, via the narrator, explicitly state that men cannot participate in this ritual. Callimachus' allusion to Homer at verses 31-32, which places between references to Athena's beauty and sexuality more conventional portrayals of her caring for her horses (verses 5-12), her avoidance of feminine oils and perfumes (verses 13-17), and her connection to the Shield of Diomedes (verses 35-42), prepares the reader for what is to come: the explicit ban of men from the ceremony, and the tragic result of Tiresias stumbling upon the bathing goddess. This allusion also introduces Callimachus' "new" image of Athena as an Artemis, and infuses the bathing scene with sexual undercurrents. Callimachus' allusion to the Homeric Hera and his attempt to portray the goddess as a sexual creature may stretch the limits of the reader's acceptance, and, furthermore, there is dissonance between Athena as a Hera and Athena as an Artemis. This reading also has an impact on how the reader then returns to, re-reads, and understands the Homeric text, so that this allusion not only creates a reflection within the Callimachean passage, it reflects upon the passage to which Callimachus alludes. The reader may first notice the ironic arming of Hera for the battle of love within an epic filled with heroes arming for battle. After reading Callimachus' allusion there is the additional dimension of the dissonance between Hera as the queen of the gods and how Homer portrays her here. This may be by design; the reader's incredulity reinforces the hymn's self-conscious, literary nature (as well as the use of non-koine lexical elements): it forces the Homeric and Callimachean to confront each other, and it marks this allusion as reflective.

The second allusion to Homer occurs at verses 66-67, at which point the description of Athena's nymph-attendants, *οὐδ' ὄαροι νυμφᾶν οὐδὲ χοροστασίαι / ἁδεῖαι τελέθεσκον, ὅκ' οὐχ ἁγεῖτο* Χαρικλώ ("and there was no song of nymphs nor sweet choral dances, where Chariclo did not lead"; *Hymn* 5.66-67), may seem familiar. It appears that Callima-

[59] Bulloch (1985), 142.

chus is alluding to one of the standard ways of depicting Artemis. Compare Callimachus' Athena with the Homeric simile likening Nausicaa to Artemis at *Od.* 6.105-106: *τῇ δέ θ' ἅμα νύμφαι, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,/ ἀγρονόμοι παίζουσι* ("together with her, the nymphs, daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus, ranging in the wild play").[60] This allusion picks up on the portrayal of the "new" aspects of Athena that began at verse 31, but this time, instead of a seductive Hera, the reader is urged to see Athena as another Artemis. Furthermore, the allusion anticipates Artemis' appearance later in the hymn as a parallel to Athena, as described by Athena herself at *Hymn* 5.107-118. This reference then becomes more complex and assumes another, reflective perspective once the reader recalls the text surrounding these Homeric verses: immediately preceeding the simile, in which Odysseus likens Nausicaa and her attendants to Artemis and her attendant nymphs,[61] Nausicaa bathes with her companions. Following the simile the young girl, though no goddess, adroitly handles the rather difficult situation of meeting the nude stranger, Odysseus, who disturbs them. Callimachus' allusion compels the reader to compare his Athena to the Homeric Artemis and Nausicaa, with the result that the mental agility of the young mortal maiden shows up the comparative heavy-handedness of both Artemis and Athena.

Bulloch calls attention to one aspect of the description of Tiresias: *Hymn* 5.75, *ἁμᾷ κυσίν* that looks forward to verse 114, *ἀλλ' αὐταί...κύνες*, with which Athena describes Actaeon.[62] From Tiresias' first appearance, then, Callimachus prepares the reader for a comparison of these two young men. Bulloch goes on to point out that this phrase is "reminiscent of Telemachus' entry to the Ithacan assembly at *Od.* 2.11,"[63] though Athena's role is different. Homer states *οὐκ οἶος, ἅμα τῷ γε κύνες πόδας ἀργοὶ ἕποντο / θεσπεσίην δ' ἄρα τῷ γε χάριν κατέχευεν Ἀθήνη* ([Telemachus] "not alone, but swift-footed dogs followed him, and Athena spread a divine grace upon him"; *Od.* 2.11-12). Both Tiresias and Telemachus are young and at first glance it may seem that Callimachus is simply adhering to a poetic convention of depicting young men accompanied by dogs. But this

60 Callimachus seems to have liked this image, for, as Bulloch (1985), 174, notes, this can also be seen in *Hymn* 3.170ff. and *Hymn* 4.16-18; see also Apollonius of Rhodes 3.881ff.

61 It was common in antiquity to compare young, unmarried girls to Artemis.

62 Bulloch (1985), 182.

63 Bulloch (1985), 182.

allusion is probably more than a reminiscence of a well-known young man of literature, for only a few verses later the reader realizes that the poet continues this comparison of the two young men (*Hymn* 5.79). At this point, with this phrase's allusion, it is important to note that Athena's role in Telemachus' life differs significantly from that in Tiresias' life; Athena's relationship with Odysseus affords his entire family protection. The Athena of the *Odyssey* is powerful and for the most part beneficent, and thus with these words Callimachus alludes reflectively to Homer; once the passages are compared, the reader detects the poet's depiction of another side of Athena.

At verses 83-84, the description of Tiresias immediately after the goddess blinds him, *ἑστάκη δ' <u>ἄφθογγος</u>, ἐκόλλασαν γὰρ ἀνῖαι / <u>γώνατα</u> καὶ <u>φωνὰν</u> ἔσχεν <u>ἀμαχανία</u>,* ("and he stood speechless, his knees glued by distress and helplessness stayed his voice"; *Hymn* 5.83-84), Callimachus employs terminology and phraseology that originate in Homer and typically were used to depict shock or the effects of love.[64] An expanded use of such a Homeric depiction occurs at *Od.* 4.703-705, where Penelope reacts to the news that her son has left the island and that the suitors intend to assassinate him upon his arrival:

> *ὣς φάτο· τῆς δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο <u>γούνατα</u> καὶ φίλον ἦτορ,*
> *δὴν δέ μιν <u>ἀμφασίη</u> ἐπέων λάβε· τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε*
> *δακρυόφι πλῆσθεν, θαλερὴ δέ οἱ ἔσχετο <u>φωνή</u>.*
>
> So he spoke and her <u>knees</u> gave way and the heart in her. For a long time she remained without a word, <u>speechless</u>, and her eyes filled with tears, the springing <u>voice</u> was held still within her.

The words *γούνατα*, *ἀμφασίη*, and *φωνή* link this passage closely to Callimachus'. Though there are other similar Homeric passages, it is likely that these are the verses to which Callimachus refers because of the parallels with Telemachus already established via allusions in the preceding lines, as well as those that follow. With this allusion the poet dramatically colors Tiresias' reaction, likening it to that of a mother who fears for her son's safety. This allusion also foreshadows Chariclo's response to her son's punishment. One notes that his depiction of the young Tiresias is composed of allusions first to Telemachus and then to Penelope, two seemingly uncongruous characters. These allu-

[64] See Bulloch (1985), 190-191 for several examples; most interesting at this juncture are *Il.* 17.695f; *Il.* 23.396ff.; *Od.* 19.471ff.

sions first beg a comparison of Telemachus', Penelope's, and of Tiresias' helplessness, with the unifying agent being Athena, who is willing to or can aid the latter two, but not the last. Initially, Callimachus seems to have incorporated key Homeric words into his text in such a way that this allusion appears integrative. Yet once the reader recalls the Homeric context, the differences between the two characters, and the two texts, become apparent. Penelope is the mother, whereas Tiresias is the son, and though Penelope fears for her son's life, the reader knows that Telemachus will return home unharmed; however otherwise compensated, Tiresias will remain blind. This juxtaposition of the differing characters and situations of the texts creates a reflective allusion.

Having established a relationship between his own characters and those of the *Odyssey*, eight verses later at verse 92, the poet continues his comparisons of his Chariclo to Penelope, and his Tiresias to Telemachus. The use of *φάεα* at verse 92 (*ὦ ὄρος, ὦ Ἑλικὼν οὐκέτι μοι παριτέ, / ἦ μεγάλ' ἀντ' ὀλίγων ἐπράξαο· δόρκας ὀλέσσας / καὶ πρόκας οὐ πολλὰς φάεα παιδὸς ἔχεις*; "oh mountain, oh Helicon, no longer to be approached by me, surely you exacted a great price for little; having lost a few gazelles and deer, you have taken the eyes of my child." *Hymn* 5.90-92), which prior to Callimachus is used only for emotional greetings in the *Odyssey*, is clearly an allusion to Homer, either *Od.* 16.15, 17.39, or 19.417.[65] This reference serves to set up the allusions that follow. At *Hymn* 5.93-95 the poet makes it clear that it is *Od.* 17.38-40 to which he alludes: *ἁ μὲν ⟨ἅμ'⟩ ἀμφοτέραισι φίλον περὶ παῖδα λαβοῖσα / μάτηρ μὲν γοερᾶν οἶτον ἀηδονίδων / ἆγε βαρὺ κλαίοισα*; ("the mother clasped her beloved child in both her arms and, she kept up the lament." *Hymn* 5. 93-95) The lexical connections between Callimachus' and Homer's texts are clear (*Od.* 17.38-40): *ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδὶ φίλῳ βάλε πήχεε δακρύσασα, / κύσσε δέ μιν κεφαλήν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλά, / καί ῥ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·* ("and crying she clasped her dear child in both her arms, and she kissed his head and both his beautiful eyes, and tearfully spoke winged words and addressed him."). It may be that, as Bulloch suggests,[66] this reference infuses the passage with "formal epic dignity…backed by some characteristically Homeric features", but there may be more to this allusion, especially given previous connections between Tiresias

[65] Bulloch (1985), 203.
[66] Bulloch (1985), 204.

and Telemachus. While Callimachus correlates Chariclo's reactions to those of Penelope, he once more simultaneously contrasts the differing situations; Penelope cries and kisses her son's head and both of his beautiful eyes with joy because he has returned home safely. Chariclo cries and embraces her son, who has lost his eyesight, with grief. Once again, after the reader recalls the passage to which Callimachus alludes, the Homeric and Callimachean texts confront one another in a literary, self-conscious manner.

In order to remind the reader of the full range of Artemis' personality as depicted in poetry, within the Actaeon exemplum, at verses 111-114, Callimachus locates another reflective allusion to Homer: *ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτὸν ὅ τε δρόμος αἵ τ' ἐν ὄρεσσι / ῥυσεῦνται ξυναὶ τᾶμος ἑκαβολίαι,/ ὁππόταν οὐκ ἐθέλων περ ἴδῃ χαρίεντα λοετρά / δαίμονος·* ("but neither the chase nor his comradeship in archery will save him on the hills in that hour, when he sees the lovely bath of the goddess, though unwillingly"; *Hymn* 5.111-114.) These verses recall another skilled young huntsman, Scamandrius, with whom Artemis had a close connection and whom she could not save from Menelaus (*Il.* 5.48-57):

τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Ἰδομενῆος ἐσύλευον θεράποντες·
υἱὸν δὲ Στροφίοιο Σκαμάνδριον αἵμονα θήρης,
Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος ἕλ' ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι,
ἐσθλὸν θηρητῆρα· δίδαξε γὰρ Ἄρτεμις αὐτὴ
βάλλειν ἄγρια πάντα, τά τε τρέφει οὔρεσιν ὕλη:
ἀλλ' οὔ οἱ τότε γε χραῖσμ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα,
οὐδὲ ἑκηβολίαι, ᾗσιν τὸ πρίν γ' ἐκέκαστο:
ἀλλὰ μιν Ἀτρεΐδης δουρικλειτὸς Μενέλαος
πρόσθεν ἕθεν φεύγοντα μετάφρενον οὔτασε δουρὶ
ὤμων μεσσηγύς, διὰ δὲ στήθεσφιν ἔλασσεν.

The henchmen of Idomeneus stripped the armor from Phaistus, while with the sharp spear Menelaus son of Atreus killed Strophius's son, a man of wisdom in the chase, Scamandrius, the fine huntsman of beasts. Artemis herself had taught him to strike down every wild thing that grows in the mountain forest. Yet Artemis of the showering arrows could not help him now, no, and not the long casts of the spear in which he had been pre-eminent. But Menelaus the spear-famed, son of Atreus, stabbed him as he fled away before him, in the back with a spear thrust between the shoulders and driven through the chest beyond it.

This allusion serves several purposes. Firstly, as an utterance of Athena, the goddess reminds Chariclo that goddesses can sometimes do nothing to protect their favorites. It also reminds the reader that Homer's Artemis had other favorites whom she could not save. After careful consideration of the texts, however, the reader should be rather skeptical of parallels Athena draws in her defense. When the fates of Scamandrius and Actaeon are compared, we remember that unlike her Trojan favorite, whom she would like to save from death but cannot, Artemis herself brings about Actaeon's death. Perhaps Callimachus' allusion here contains the additional implication that being a goddess' favorite may not be as beneficial as one might think.

Finally, Athena's promise to Chariclo of verses 129-130 gains authority from the Homeric text, while it plays with literary tradition: καὶ μόνος, εὖτε θάνῃ, πεπνυμένος ἐν νεκύεσσι / φοιτασεῖ, μεγάλῳ τίμιος Ἀγεσίλᾳ. ("and when he dies he alone will walk among the dead having understanding, honored by the great Leader of the People"; *Hymn* 5.129-130). Pherecydes, as recorded by Apollodorus, makes no mention of Tiresias retaining his wits after death. This is referred to only at *Od.* 10.490-495, and it is to this passage that Callimachus alludes:

> ἀλλ' ἄλλην χρὴ πρῶτον ὁδὸν τελέσαι καὶ ἱκέσθαι
> εἰς Ἀίδαο δόμους καὶ ἐπαινῆς Περσεφονείης.
> ψυχῇ χρησομένους Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο
> μάντηος ἀλαοῦ, τοῦ τε φρένες ἔμπεδοί εἰσι·
> τῷ καὶ τεθνηῶτι νόον πόρε Περσεφόνεια
> οἴῳ πεπνῦσθαι· τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀίσσουσιν.

> But first there is another journey you must accomplish and reach the house of Hades and of revered Persephone, there to consult with the soul of Tiresias the Theban, the blind prophet, whose senses are unshaken within him, to him Persephone has granted intelligence after death; but the rest are flittering shadows.

The allusion is once more verified lexically via πεπνυμένος and πεπνῦσθαι. The contexts of these words compel the reader to see verses 129-130 as an allusion to the Tiresias of the *Odyssey* and to notice how Callimachus both likens his text to Homer's, yet also indicates his amendment of the Homeric tradition; his Athena pronounces that *she* grants Tiresias his prophetic ability and insures that he retains it after

death. This seems to be a playful correction of the Homeric text, in which the seer continued to be able to prophesize after his death due to Persephone's influence.

Given Callimachus' poetic sophistication, it should be no surprise that this reference is multi-layered. The reader will remember that the poet alluded to the *Odyssey* earlier in his hymn in such as way as to correlate Telemachus to Tiresias. In Homer πεπνυμένος is an epithet describing many characters. In the *Iliad* it is seen primarily in "speech introductions for various peripheral young men," which fits the character of the youthful Tiresias.[67] In the *Odyssey*, however, with only four exceptions, the participle is used in speech introductions for Telemachus.[68] Thus on another level this reflective allusion reminds the reader of the previous analogue of Tiresias as a Telemachus in such as way that the reader is impressed with the poet's "new" image of Tiresias; the reader knows of Telemachus only as a young man growing up and Tiresias, before Callimachus, only as an old seer.

In a general sense, all of the allusions examined above in some way authenticate Callimachus' hymn and situate it within the Greek poetic tradition. Bulloch points out that the poet "looks to Homer because the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were the great poetic monuments, and a 'given' in Greek culture".[69] Perhaps what Bulloch means by this is that Callimachus alludes to the Homeric epics because Homeric vocabulary, phraseology (especially when compared to the Hellenistic koine), and scenes were considered the foundation of poetry and would have been readily recognized by the reader. There is undoubtedly a great deal of truth in this assertion. However, the above examination of these series of reflective allusions reveals something more. Callimachus' juxtaposition of "old" and "new" texts demands an intellectually active reader to identify the allusions and apply them to the hymn. One of the primary effects of these allusions then becomes an emphasis of the new and somewhat unexpected ways in which Callimachus portrays the characters within the poem, and in particular its object, Athena.

[67] See Beck (1998-1999), 125 and n.16-17, and Ugolini (1995) for a thorough study of the character of Tiresisas in all extant sources.

[68] The exceptions are: Laertes (24.375) and Medon the herald (4.711, 22.361, 24.442). Outside the context of speech introductions the participle is used in the *Odyssey* to modify a group of characters "more central and older than those so described in the *Il.*" (Beck 1998-1999, 125): Nestor (3.20, 3.52), Menelaus (4.190), and Odysseus (8.388).

[69] Bulloch (1985), 29.

Ovid's Reiterative Integrative and Reflective Allusions

As discussed earlier in this chapter, Ovid marks both the beginning and end of his Tiresias narrative as allusive with the words *memorant* and *fertur*. These markers would seem to point to Ovid's making reference to the Hesiodic account of Tiresias' blinding, though when compared, the reader can find no lexical parallels. Ovid may have signposted his version as relying on Hesiod's account in general, but as outlined earlier, Ovid deviates from this version in several details.[70]

When we turn to Ovid's Actaeon narrative, we see that, though the Roman poet may have alluded to other sources lost to us, he clearly alludes to both Callimachus' brief version of Actaeon and to his Tiresias. Ovid makes integrative allusions by incorporating Callimachus' Actaeon into his narrative; the boy is young, *iuvenis* (*Met.* 3.146), and he inadvertently transgresses divine law, *per nemus ignotum non certis passibus errans / pervenit in lucum: sic illum fata ferebant* ("wandering with uncertain steps through the wood, ignorant, he came to a grove; in this way the fates were carrying him"; *Met.* 3.175-176). This echoes Callimachus' portrayal of Actaeon; he too is young, *τὸν ἀβατὰν Ἀκταίονα* ("the youthful Actaeon" *Hymn* 5.109), and unwittingly commits his offence, *οὐκ ἐθέλων....ἴδῃ χαριέντα λοετρά / δαίμονος* ("he saw the lovely bath of the goddess, unwillingly"; *Hymn* 5.113-114). Finally, like Callimachus, Ovid concentrates on the manner of punishment of the young man, though Ovid's *canes satiatae sanguine erili* ("the dogs satiated by their master's blood"; *Met.* 3.140), as well as the description of verses 3.225-252, is *in toto* much longer than Callimachus' verse and a half, *ἀλλ' αὐταὶ τὸν πρὶν ἄνακτα κύνες / τουτάκι δειπνησεῦντι* ("the dogs will then dine on their former master"; *Hymn* 5.114-115). It must be said, however, that each poet concentrates on the young man's punishment for very different reasons; Callimachus' Athena evokes Actaeon's future death to emphasize the relative leniency of Tiresias' punishment, while Ovid concentrates on the same punishment, now in the past, which has the effect of heightening the pathos of the story.

In his portrayal of Actaeon's death Ovid simultaneously alludes reflectively to Callimachus' treatment of Tiresias, Chariclo, and Athena. These allusions appear to be designed to encourage the reader

[70] See pp. 81-82.

to compare the characters which are, on the one hand, joined together only in Callimachus' *Lavacrum Palladis*, but are also rather dissonantly joined together again in the subtext of Ovid's narrative.

Beginning with the setting of Ovid's tale, the alert reader will notice that instead of Mt. Cithaeron, the traditional *locus* of the Actaeon tale, Ovid shifts the backdrop of his story to Gargaphia, a valley near Thebes; he is the first to connect this locale with the Actaeon myth. Ovid's detailed descriptions of the environs of the valley and time of day reveal a likely allusion to Callimachus' story, which is set at Hippocrene, the famous fountain on Mt. Helicon, also near Thebes.[71] Ovid writes at *Met.* 3.143-157:

> *Mons* erat infectus variarum caede ferarum
> iamque *dies medius* rerum *contraxerat umbras*
> et *sol ex aequo meta distabat utraque*,
> cum iuvenis placido per devia lustra vagantes
> participes operum conpellat *Hyantius* ore:
>
> The mountain was stained with the bloodshed
> of many kinds of wild beasts, and midday had
> shortened the shadows, and the sun was equally
> distant from both turning points, when the young
> Actaeon called to his comrades, as they roamed
> the lonely thickets, saying in a gentle tone:

This passage parallels the portion of Callimachus' *Hymn* that describes the area around Hippocrene and the time of day when Athena and Chariclo prepare for their baths (*Hymn* 5.70-74):

> *δή ποκα γὰρ πέπλων λυσαμένα περόνας*
> *ἵππω ἐπὶ κράνᾳ Ἑλικωνίδι καλὰ ῥεοίσᾳ*
> *λῶντο· μεσαμβρινὰ δ' εἶχ' ὄρος ἁσυχία.*
> *ἀμφότεραι λώοντο, μεσαμβριναὶ δ' ἔσαν ὧραι,*
> *πολλὰ δ' ἁσυχία τῆνο κατεῖχεν ὄρος.*
>
> One day they undid the buckles of their robes
> beside the fair-flowing fountain of the horse on
> Helicon and bathed; and noontime quiet held
> the hill. Those two were bathing and it was
> the noontime hour and a great quiet held that hill.

Ovid chooses a neutral term, *mons* ("mountain"; verse 143), to denote a geographical location which is much like Callimachus' *ὄρος* ("moun-

[71] See Bömer (1968), 492 and notice that in using "Gargaphie" Ovid shows a preference for the Greek over the Latin termination, as is often the case.

tain"; verses 72 and 74). Both stress that the time of the scene is midday, and thus allude to the topos of noon being a critically disastrous time for mortals who encounter or disturb a divinity.[72] Callimachus uses the term for midday twice to emphasize the impending disaster, and for a similar effect Ovid chooses two phrases: *dies medius* ("the middle of the day"), closely related to and in the same metrical sedes as *μεσαμβρινά* ("noon-tide"), and *sol ex aequo meta distabat utraque* ("the sun was equidistant from both turning-points"), a phrase that poetically describes the sun and the shadows cast at midday, and which may be a poetic variation of the Callimachean *μεσαμβρινά* (or *μεσαμβριναί*). Thus far it would seem that Ovid uses integrative allusions to lull the reader into seeing Actaeon as another Tiresias, but in his treatment of Actaeon the poet reveals that these characters, contrary to what Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 encourages the reader to believe, are only somewhat similar.

Ovid sketches his unwitting transgressor as lightly and briefly as Callimachus does Tiresias, and he too concentrates upon the character's youth, his intentions, and the predestined nature of his fate. As we have just seen, Ovid's Actaeon is *iuvenis* ("a youth"; *Met.* 3.146) just as is Callimachus' Tiresias, *ἄρτι γένεια περκάζων* ("just as his chin was growing dark"; *Hymn* 5.75-76). Both youths have been hunting prior to their encounters. Tiresias walks toward Hippocrene and the bathing goddess accompanied by his dogs (verses 75-76), while Actaeon has just left his hunting companions and hounds (verses 146-154).[73] Each of the young men journeys towards their disastrous encounters similarly. Like Callimachus, Ovid emphasizes that Actaeon wanders through a sacred area seeking out nothing in particular: *per nemus ignotum non certis passibus errans / pervenit in lucum: sic illum fata ferebant* ("wandering with uncertain steps through the wood, ignorant, he came to a grove; in this way the fates were carrying him"; *Met.* 3.175-176); he is unaware that this area is sacred to *succinctae Dianae* ("girdled Diana"; *Met.* 3.156). These verses are an expanded version of Callimachus' compact *ἱερὸν χῶρον ἀνεστρέφετο* (verse 76) and *οὐκ ἐθέλων* (verse 78). Furthermore, just as Callimachus' Tiresias is fated to be struck blind (verses 104-105), Ovid stresses that Actaeon's unwit-

[72] Bulloch (1985), 179.

[73] Ovid does not introduce the youth's dogs until after his metamorphosis (verse 206), and, given the nature of Actaeon's death, the poet may have chosen to delay the introduction of the dogs in order to increase the drama of the episode.

ting transgression and his resulting death are also due to fate (verses 141-142 and 176). If the reader has recognized these allusions to Callimachus' poem, he may compare the characters of Actaeon and Tiresias and be struck not by their similarities, as drawn by Callimachus, but by the dissimilarities. The reader realizes that Actaeon will be torn apart by his own hunting dogs, while Tiresias, though blind, will live a long, illustrious life, and will be honored even after life. Therefore, the allusions serve to heighten the emotional impact of the story. Ovid's reflective allusions to Callimachus' Tiresias also compel the reader to remember Callimachus' text. It is there where he finds that Tiresias and Actaeon are first compared by Athena who verifies that Tiresias's fate is preferable to Actaeon's: *ὀλβίσταν ἐρέει σε καὶ εὐαίωνα γενέσθαι, / ἐξ ὀρέων ἀλαὸν παῖδ' ὑποδεξαμέναν* ("she will call you happiest of women and of happy fate, you who received your blind son home from the hills"; *Hymn* 5.117-118). Thus these allusions to Callimachus' poem authenticate Ovid's Actaeon, both because the poem itself is part of the literary tradition and because one of its characters, the goddess herself, first compared these two young men and pointed out the differences.

Ovid continues the series of reflective allusions in his description of the effects of Diana's punishment upon Actaeon by conflating and referring to Callimachus' portrayal of the effects of Athena's punishment upon Tiresias and Chariclo. Callimachus' Tiresias is struck dumb first by the sight of the nude goddess and then by his resulting blindness. Callimachus briefly describes the physical effects on Tiresias of Athena's punishment (*Hymn* 5.83-84). Ovid's Actaeon is speechless, *vox nulla secuta est* ("no voice followed"; *Met.* 3.201), but he immediately flees in the form of a deer (*Met.* 3.198-199), unlike Tiresias who stands stock still. After his transformation, Chariclo gives voice to her own and her son's feelings (*Met.* 3.85-92), and this, in combination with the description of Tiresias' physical state, may be taken to reflect how Tiresias feels (*Hymn* 5.85-92):

> *ἁ νύμφα δ' ἐβόασε· "τί μοι τὸν κῶρον ἔρεξας*
> *πότνια; τοιαῦται, δαίμονες, ἐστὲ φίλαι;*
> *ὄμματά μοι τῶ παιδὸς ἀφείλεο. τέκνον ἄλαστε,*
> *εἶδες Ἀθαναίας στήθεα καὶ λαγόνας,*
> *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀέλιον πάλιν ὄψεαι. ὢ ἐμὲ δειλάν,*
> *ὢ ὄρος, ὢ Ἑλικὼν οὐκέτι μοι παριτέ,*
> *ἦ μεγάλ' ἀντ' ὀλίγων ἐπράξαο· δόρκας ὀλέσσας*
> *καὶ πρόκας οὐ πολλὰς φάεα παιδὸς ἔχεις."*

> But the nymph cried: "What have you done to my boy, lady? Is such the friendship of you goddesses? You have taken away the eyes of my son. Foolish child, you have seen the breast and body of Athena, but you will not see the sun again. O unhappy me! O hill, O Helicon, where I may no longer come, surely you have exacted a great price for a little. Losing a few gazelles and deer you have taken the eyes of my child."

Ovid alludes to this scene by conflating the reactions of the two characters of Chariclo and Tiresias into the single character of Actaeon. Actaeon is a follower of Diana (though the reader must infer this through his knowledge of the tradition, since Ovid does not mention this in his own narrative) as Chariclo is of Athena, and Actaeon, like Tiresias, is young, and his physical reaction after the divinity speaks is similar to Tiresias'; he too is in a state of shock and cannot answer the goddess' pronouncement. Once he is transformed into a stag, via a vivid description of Actaeon's actions and the interior dialogue of the young man, Ovid portrays his psychological state, just as Callimachus fully describes the psychological impact of Athena's punishment upon Tiresias and his mother (*Met.* 3.193-205):

> nec plura minata
> dat sparso capiti vivacis cornua cervi,
> dat spatium collo summasque cacuminat aures
> cum pedibusque manus, cum longis bracchia mutat
> cruribus et velat maculoso vellere corpus;
> additus et pavor est. fugit Autonoeius heros
> et se tam celerem cursu miratur in ipso.
> ut vero vultus et cornua vidit in unda,
> "me miserum!" dicturus erat: vox nulla secuta est;
> ingemuit: vox illa fuit, lacrimaeque per ora
> non sua fluxerunt; mens tantum pristina mansit.
> quid faciat? repetatne domum et regalia tecta
> an lateat silvis? timor hoc, pudor inpedit illud.

> She uttered no more threats, but made the horns of a long-lived stag sprout where she had scattered water on his brow. She lengthened his neck, brought the tips of his ears to a point, changed his hands to feet, his arms to long legs, and covered his body with a dappled skin. Then she put panic fear in his heart as well. The hero, the son of Autonoe fled, and even as he ran, marveled

> to find himself so swift. When he glimpsed his face and his horns, reflected in the water, he tried to say "Miserable me!" but no words came. He groaned—that was all the voice he had—and tears ran down his cheeks that were no longer his own. Only his mind remained the same as before. What was he to do? Return home to the royal palace, or hide in the woods? He was afraid to do the second, ashamed to do the first.

Like Callimachus' Tiresias, Actaeon is unable to speak after his metamorphosis, but his is not due only to shock, but to the physical limitations of his new body, and as Callimachus' Chariclo laments for her own son, Actaeon himself laments his fate and asks himself questions about his immediate fate. But again, in this conflation and allusions to the Callimachean story of Tiresias, if the reader continues to compare texts, the memory of the account of Callimachus only serves to heighten the pathos of Actaeon's fate. The reader may be struck by the fact that, unlike Tiresias, Actaeon has no one to defend him and cannot defend himself; even this is denied him. Because of this, and because of his new body, he will not live, while Tiresias, defended by his mother, does. Furthermore, nowhere in the narrative does Ovid mention the special relationship between Actaeon and Diana, which, as Callimachus' Athena points out (*Hymn* 5.110-111), allows Actaeon no special dispensation. This leads the reader to consider the change Ovid has made in the focus of his story. Callimachus concentrates upon Tiresias' and Actaeon's punishment, as well as the special relationship shared by the goddess and Chariclo, because his point is to illustrate why men cannot partake of the ceremony of bathing Athena's statue. Ovid may have omitted the connection between Actaeon and Diana in order to make the young man's fate even more pathetic; if there is no connection between the goddess and Actaeon, then the arbitrary nature of his death makes his demise as horrific as Tiresias' punishment.

Ovid's characterization of Diana appears to be the point at which references to Callimachus end. Otis believes that Callimachus' portrayal of Athena is sympathetic—she is a stately goddess obeying divine law—while he views Ovid's portrayal of Diana as sarcastic and malevolent to the point of being a frigid puritan.[74] Yet a case can be made that the portrayals of both goddesses are similar and that Ovid's

[74] See Otis (1970), 398-99. For another view of Callimachus' Athena see Bulloch (1985), 209-230.

portrayal of Diana is an integrative allusion to Callimachus' Athena. The primary difference lies in the opacity of the characterizations.

Both goddesses are angry once they realize mortal men have seen them nude. Callimachus simply writes of Athena and Chariclo bathing, of Tiresias' intrusion, and the goddess' immediate reaction (*Hymn* 5.77-81):

> *διψάσας δ' ἄφατόν τι ποτὶ ῥόον ἤλυθε κράνας,*
> *σχέτλιος· οὐκ ἐθέλων δ' εἶδε τὰ μὴ θεμιτά.*
> *τὸν δὲ χολωσαμένα περ ὅμως προσέφασεν Ἀθάνα·*
> *"τίς σε, τὸν ὀφθαλμὼς οὐκέτ' ἀποισόμενον,*
> *ὦ Εὐηρείδα, χαλεπὰν ὁδὸν ἄγαγε δαίμων;"*
>
> And thirsting beyond telling, he
> came to the flowing fountain, wretched man! And un-
> willingly saw that which is not lawful to be seen. And
> Athena was angered, and said to him: "What god, o
> son of Everes, led you on this grievous way?"

Ovid alludes to Athena's reaction and expands upon it, and in this way creates a dialogue between his own Diana and Callimachus' Athena. He describes how the nymphs of Artemis try to shield the nude goddess from view, how embarrassment seizes the goddess herself, and how after the embarrassment fades, the goddess becomes angry (*Met.* 3.186-193):

> quae [Diana] quamquam comitum turba stipata suarum
> in latus obliquum tamen adstitit oraque retro
> flexit et, ut vellet promptas habuisse sagittas
> quas habuit, sic hausit aquas vultumque virilem
> perfudit spargensque comas ultricibus undis
> addidit haec cladis praenuntia verba futurae:
> "nunc tibi me posito visam velamine narres,
> si poteris narrare, licet."
>
> Though surrounded by her comrades,
> who gathered closely around her, she stood turned
> aside, looking back over her shoulder. She wished
> she had her arrows ready; instead she caught up a
> handful of the water that she did have, and threw
> it in the young man's face. As she sprinkled his
> hair with the vengeful water she spoke these words,
> foretelling future disaster: "Now, if you are able to tell, may
> you tell that you saw me when I was undressed."

Like Callimachus' Athena, Diana expresses no sympathy for Actaeon's fate.[75] Because Ovid's Diana sarcastically says *nunc tibi me posito visam velamine narres,/ si poteris narare, licet* ("now if you are able to tell, may you tell that you saw me when I was undressed"; *Met.* 3.192-193) before transforming Actaeon, she is seen as cold and vengeful.[76] In contrast Callimachus' Athena, though angered, is seemingly calm, and after Chariclo's outburst, she immediately blames fate, not the young man himself, for his punishment. The reader will notice that the only sympathy Athena displays is not towards Tiresias, but towards his mother, her favorite, in the form of a *consolatio*. The fact that Athena offers consolation for Tiresias' blindness has led many to believe that she is portrayed more sympathetically. If the reader recalls only Athena's words to Chariclo, this is true. However, the reader may ask whether Chariclo's presence has an impact on Tiresias' fate. The goddess herself says not. But Athena's *consolatio*, perhaps too perfect and rhetorically too solid, reveals her true nature.[77] The goddess first tries to distance herself from the blinding of her favorite's son by citing Cronus' law regarding mortals who see gods against the gods' will (*Hymn* 5.98-102), and to explain the irrevocability of the blinding she says that it was so fated (*Hymn* 5.103-106). Then, to convince Chariclo of the lightness of Tiresias' punishment the goddess uses the exemplum of Actaeon's future death (*Hymn* 5.107-118). For these reasons then, Chariclo should not lament. Callimachus does not tell us if this speech consoles the goddess' favorite and her son, though such a solid piece of argumentation, without human emotions factored in, probably would not achieve its goal. As Depew has pointed out, how can Athena, the masculine goddess born from no mother, understand Chariclo's maternal feelings and respond appropriately? Of course she cannot. Neither can Ovid's Artemis, the chaste virgin goddess of the hunt, react differently to Actaeon's transgression, unwitting though it may be. Ovid's depiction of Artemis may, then, be an integrative allusion to the more reasoned cruelty of Callimachus' Athena; it urges the reader to compare the overtly unsympathetic Diana to the somewhat sympathetic

[75] Though Callimachus' narrator states that Athena feels sympathy for *Chariclo* 5.95.

[76] E.g. Otis (1970), 399.

[77] See Depew (1994), 425-426, and Haslam (1993), 122-123. Haslam writes: "This [the *consolatio*] is terrific rhetoric, but in terms of the human situation it is sick." Bulloch (1985), 219-220, believes that it is beyond the limit of acceptability and that her (Athena's) rhetoric almost undermines her credibility.

Athena. Once the reader has fully considered Athena's actions and reactions in their entirety, it seems that in one verse, in which Artemis pronounces Actaeon's fate, Ovid has consolidated the lack of human feeling inherent in the Callimachean Athena's *consolatio*. Yet in the final analysis, because the reader must compare the outcome of each goddess' punishment, the allusion turns into a reflective allusion; both divinities lack compassion for the young men, but the punishment they mete out differs.

Within Ovid's Actaeon narrative we have seen that, not surprisingly, the poet alludes integratively to Callimachus' Actaeon. The effect is that the allusions serve to authenticate Ovid's story as belonging to the literary tradition. As discussed above, Callimachus' reflective allusions to Homeric passages have the effect of emphasizing the "newness" of his portrayal of Athena. Ovid's series of reflective allusions create a subtext that shows that he was actively engaging Callimachus' text with his own, making the reader well aware that he was conscious of the comparisons his predecessor drew. However, because the characters of Diana and Athena, and the fates of Actaeon and Tiresias, are indeed at odds, the allusions ultimately heighten the pathos of the Actaeon story.

Allusive Manipulation of the Texts

Thus far this chapter has focused on Callimachus' reflective and Ovid's integrative and reflective allusions based on lexical similarities. This mode of reference is what is most easily identifiable and most often discussed. However, as we shall see, we can extend the definition of allusion to include more general poetic techniques. When we consider Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 and Book 3 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* we will discover that both poets also allude, in this case reflectively, by means of their manipulation of the framework in which the tales are set and the arrangement of the tales in relation to one another. Both Ovid's and Callimachus' manipulation of the texts (or we might call it one aspect of their poetic technique) can be seen as reflective allusions to those of their predecessors. Their handling of the tales constantly provokes the consideration of other texts, and imbues their narratives with the senses of variation, modification, and difference.

One example of allusions based upon manipulation of texts is the artificial framework both poets constructed to surround their renditions of these two stories. One of the singular features of Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 is that it is mounted within a mimetic frame. As discussed earlier, the notion of mimesis as an aspect of a cult hymn was not exceptional in antiquity. The Greek gods demonstrated to mortals how to worship them,[78] and mortals, following the divine example, looked upon the cult image, gave the gods gifts and offerings, and sang words they hoped would please the divinities, so that for a period of time the mortals were assimilated to the god(s) - *ὁμοίωσις θεῷ*.[79] The reader of Callimachus' hymn first realizes that he is to imagine that he is either witnessing or participating in a ritual bath of the cult statue of Athena at Argos. "The speaker" of the poem then begins a mythic story about Athena, which leads the reader to believe that he is indeed reading a hymn. Unlike a traditional hymn, in which such a tale is hardly unexpected, the reader encounters something quite unusual in this hymn: an extended dialogue between Athena and Chariclo (*Hymn* 5.85-92; 97-130), and not until the poem's conclusion is the reader reminded that the poem he is reading is a mimetic hymn (*Hymn* 5.137).[80] As Bulloch points out, Callimachus' insertion of references to the ritual are an attempt at verisimilitude; the hymn is not "for a ritual but a literary poem designed to create the illusion of a ceremony actually being performed".[81] Thus the *Lavacrum Palladis* is an imitation of a mimetic hymn. The mimetic framework of the poem can then be seen as a reflective allusion to the tradition of cult hymns. One also might say that this reflective allusion, that is, the mimetic framework of *Hymn* 5, "interrupts" the convention of mimesis and points out the artificial, mimetic nature of conventional cult hymns.

As we have seen, Callimachus sets within this mimetic framework rather unexpected versions of three tales. As summarized above, the central story of Tiresias' blinding occurs only once in extant literature before Callimachus' fifth *Hymn,*[82] and the reader may find this particular aetiology of Tiresias' prophetic powers unusual, especially in its

[78] Rudhardt (1992), 181-187.
[79] As described by philosophers; see Furley and Bremer (2001), 17 n. 51.
[80] *Hymn* 6 also contains a great deal of dialogue.
[81] Bulloch (1985), 5.
[82] See above pp. 73-75.

connection to Athena.[83] The Callimachean account of Actaeon's death may or may not have been surprising, but it certainly is a parallel to Tiresias' fate.[84] Perhaps most surprising is Athena's consolation of Chariclo, which before this poem had been associated with Actaeon's death.[85] For several reasons it is impossible to pinpoint precisely Callimachus' sources for these three unusual versions, but we can say with some certainty that the poet drew from diverse sources outside the hymnic tradition. This suggests that Callimachus' selection and combination of stories constitute a reflective allusion to the types of stories usually occurring within the hymnic genre and that this allusion in turn calls the boundaries of the genre into question.

Not only may the reader not anticipate these versions of the mythic stories, the novel arrangement within the poem is unanticipated. The poet embeds the *consolatio* of Chariclo, a narrative more commonly associated with Actaeon, within the story of Tiresias' blinding. Then the story of Actaeon and Artemis, a parallel of the Tiresias story, is inserted into the *consolatio*. This innovative manipulation of tales implies Callimachus' awareness of the reader's expectations and his avoidance of these expectations. The poet's manipulation of texts is another reflective reference to the reader's more general generic expectations.

In the proem of the *Metamorphoses* Ovid informs the reader that his poem is set within a chronological framework, and though the internal arrangement of stories has been discussed in various ways,[86] the poet is true to his word; the poem begins with the ordering of chaos and ends with Augustan order. Ovid has created a Latin *Theogony* and *Catalogue*.[87] The over-arching chronological arrangement, however, is often obscured by anachronistic narratives; the result is that the reader loses sight of the poem's structure.[88] Like Callimachus, Ovid uses an artificial structure, i.e. a chronological narrative, into which he inserts his tales. For example, if we consider Book 3 of the poem, the poet relates

[83] This point was made by Wilamowitz (1924), 23 and Haslam (1993), 124 but has been opposed by Bulloch (1985), 19 n. 24.
[84] See pp. 73-74.
[85] In *POxy* 2509, attributed to the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, Athena delivers a speech of consolation to Chiron and to his wife, Chariclo, after the death of Chiron's pupil, Actaeon. See pp. 77-78.
[86] For a good overviews of various classifications of the structure of the *Metamorphoses* see Crabbe (1981), 2274-2327 and Holzberg (1997), 71-72.
[87] See Ludwig (1965), 74ff.
[88] A point made by Crabbe (1981), 2275.

two stories, that of Tiresias' blinding and that of Acoetes' tale of the Lydian sailors, as occurring temporally before the other stories in this book. When this story-telling device is combined with narratives sometimes long and rich in detail, the chronological structure of the poem falls away, and when the poet re-instates it within the poem, its artificiality becomes apparent to the reader. The reader may forgive the poet for using the convenient device of a chronological structure to present his stories. On the other hand, given that the poem begins with the mythical and concludes with the historical, the artificial framework of the *Metamorphoses* can be considered a reflective allusion to all chronologically presented poems, such as Hesiod's *Theogony*, perhaps crossing generic lines to chronological mythological treatises and even histories. The broad allusion compels the reader to re-evaluate Ovid's obviously contrived framework as well as the chronological frameworks into which others have set their narratives—mythic and historic—and to ask what differentiates myth and history, fiction and fact.

If the framework of Ovid's poem is contrived, so too are the arrangement and forced connections of the tales he relates. The story that opens Book 3, that of Cadmus founding Thebes, is connected to Actaeon's death via kinship as well as chronology, since Actaeon is Cadmus' grandson. The link between Bacchus' birth and Tiresias' acquisition of prophetic powers is certainly artificial; the poet writes simply (*Met.* 3.316-318): *Dumque ea per terras fatali lege geruntur / tutaque bis geniti sunt incunabula Bacchi,/ forte* ("while these things were being done on earth by fate's decree, and the cradle of twice-born Bacchus was safely guarded, by chance, ..."). In this rather contrived way Ovid moves from Semele's death and Bacchus' birth to Tiresias. After the reader has read the full accounts of the fates of Actaeon and Tiresias, the poet ingeniously connects all other major stories of this book to these characters and their stories. Tiresias' tale frames that of Echo and Narcissus, appearing at *Met.* 3.318-348 and 3.511-12, and leads into Pentheus' horrific death (*Met.* 3.511-512). At the close of Book 3, Actaeon makes his final appearance when Pentheus, pleading with his aunt Autonoe, asks her to remember his cousin Actaeon, her son: "*fer opem, matertera,*" *dixit* / "*Autonoe! moveant animos Actaeonis umbrae!*" ("Help me, aunt Autonoe, let the ghost of Actaeon move you to pity me!"; *Met.* 3.719-720). Whereas Callimachus starkly juxtaposes tales previously unrelated and encourages an active reader to participate in deciphering a fuller meaning of the hymn, Ovid's

method is seemingly more direct and straightforward, and yet subtler; his technique is to simply signal to the reader that a given story has ended and another has begun. The alert reader will not be lulled into complicity, but with the aid of Ovid's arrangement of stories, he or she will recall previous occurrences of the tales, as well as the pre-Ovidian relationships of the tales to one another, and will compare these with Ovid's. Thus the clever arrangement of stories also constitutes a reflective reference to their many other versions.

More specifically, Ovid echoes Callimachus' particular re-arrangement of the stories of Tiresias and Actaeon. Where Callimachus embeds and joins three previously unconnected tales, Ovid separates the same tales and rejoins them in such a way that this re-arrangement recalls Callimachus' arrangement of the same stories. Ovid plucks the Actaeon tale from the "center" of Callimachus' hymn. He chose to re-tell Callimachus' version, but Ovid embellishes greatly the story described quite briefly in Callimachus' *Hymn* 5.107-118, making it his own, while retaining the story's exemplary power (*Met.* 3.135-137). Ovid then takes the primary tale of Callimachus' hymn, Tiresias' blinding, and transforms it back into another, more "usual" version. He strips away the tale's exemplary power, shortens it, and fashions it as a link between two of the book's major stories. Thus, Tiresias, the major linking device in the hymn, becomes a minor linking device in Ovid's poem.

Ovid does more than reverse Callimachus' order of presentation of the Tiresias and Actaeon stories. He imitates and reverses Callimachus' embedding of his Actaeon story within the Tiresias story, but he also self-consciously inverts the order of Callimachus' narrative. Once Actaeon reappears at the end of the third book, in a sense the story of Tiresias becomes embedded within that of Actaeon. In the end, when one reads Book 3 of the *Metamorphoses* one must think of Callimachus' fifth *Hymn* because of the similar stories of Actaeon, the differing versions of Tiresias, and the differences between the arrangements of both texts. Thus, like Callimachus, Ovid has constructed a reflective allusion in the manner in which he has manipulated the tales of Tiresias and Actaeon to simultaneously recall and contrast with the versions of Callimachus.

Conclusion

Moving from the localized allusions examined in the second chapter, this chapter has attempted to broaden the scope of the examination of allusive technique used by Callimachus and Ovid. We have seen that to aid the reader, as well as to emphasize the highly literary nature of their poems, both poets annotate their texts by employing internal, or integrated, signposts indicating that their narratives belong to the mythic tradition and marking particular portions of their texts as allusive. Ovid, who accentuates his poem with external as well as internal markings, is especially adept at calling the reader's attention to his references.

Considering the allusions explored here, it has been shown that in his Actaeon tale Ovid alludes both integratively and reflectively to Callimachus' Actaeon and Tiresias respectively. By incorporating aspects of Callimachus' Actaeon into his text, these integrative allusions serve to authenticate Ovid's own version of the Actaeon tale, while the reflective references to Callimachus' Tiresias reveal to the reader that the poet was well aware of his predecessor's treatment of Tiresias and Actaeon as parallel tales.

In contrast to Ovid, Callimachus does not appear to allude lexically to his sources, but instead chooses to refer to poetry that lies outside his own subject matter. Within his version of the Tiresias-Actaeon story the poet alludes reflectively seven times to the Homeric epics. Though these allusions might in some degree be expected given that the Homeric poems were considered the foundation of Greek poetry, and that references to the epics might lend a poem solemnity, the reflective nature of these allusions serves to underscore Callimachus' innovative portrayal of the hymn's characters, particularly the object of his hymn, Athena.

Finally, continuing to expand the definition of allusion, we have seen that in using one aspect of poetic technique, i.e. the manners in which they manipulate tales, both poets, but particularly Callimachus, allude reflectively to generic traditions and to the reader's generic expectations. These more broad and general reflective allusions invite the reader to compare aspects of Callimachus and Ovid's compositions, such as framework and arrangement, with more traditional poems of the same genre. The result is that the reader must ask what constitutes a given genre and question the genres's boundaries.

CHAPTER FOUR

VARIATION OF THE TROPE: REFLECTIVE AND INTEGRATIVE ALLUSION AND AUTHORIZATION WITHIN CALLIMACHUS' *HYMN TO DELOS* AND OVID'S BOOK 6 OF THE *METAMORPHOSES*

ἕτερος ἐξ ἑτέρου σοφός
τό τε πάλαι τό τε νῦν.
(*φησὶ* Βα*κχυλίδης ἐν τοῖς* Πα*ιᾶσιν.*
οὐδὲ γὰρ ῥᾷστον)
ἀρρήτων ἐπέων πύλας
ἐξευρεῖν.

One man gains wisdom from another,
both of old and now, too.
(says Bacchylides in his *Paeans*;
for it is no easy matter)
to find out the gates of words
unspoken before.
(Bacchylides *Paeans* Fr. 5)

Introduction

As in Callimachus' *Lavacrum Palladis*, the reader discovers a somewhat unusual nexus of stories in Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*. As the hymn unfolds, the poet reveals the island's pre-Apolline existence, Leto's extensive wanderings while in search of a haven to give birth, the many locations which rejected her, two prophecies of Apollo *in utero*, one of which is a paean to Ptolemy II, the other a reference to Niobe and the god's future punishment of her, as well as the eventual birth of the god.[1] Almost two and a half centuries later these same three

[1] See Barchiesi (1994), 438-443 who examines how Virgil uses Callimachus' precedent of the constellation of Apollo, Delos, the Ptolemies, Cos, and Alexandria for his constellation of Apollo, Delos, the Julians, Troy, and Rome. See also Stephens'

characters, Asteria/Delos, Latona, and Niobe, appear in a series of interconnected tales within the first third of Book 6 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Asteria appears briefly within a story that is in turn linked to the tale of Niobe's hubris and punishment, in which the poet also inserts a reference to Latona's wanderings and the birth of her divine twins. Niobe's tale then merges into another story concerning Latona. In this narrative Ovid inserts another reference to the birth of Apollo and Artemis.

This coincidence of characters and their stories, separated by approximately two hundred and fifty years, should not be attributed to the poets' treatment of similar subject matter. As we shall see, Ovid is indebted to Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*, as well as a range of other sources, and signals this with several integrative and reflective allusions, and Callimachus alludes to both the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and the poetry of Pindar. Like the preceding chapter, this chapter will study the poets' use of integrative and reflective allusion within discrete portions of their texts. We shall see that in his *Hymn* 4 Callimachus alludes in a very systematic manner that simultaneously verifies and distinguishes his poem from the hymnic genre. At first glance, Ovid's mode of allusion will seem less orderly, more organic, but there is a pattern lying underneath. Previously unexamined, but in some ways comparable to the "signpost technique" discussed in the previous chapter, is the technique of authorization. This mode of allusion allows a poet to use a character within his work to allude to other poems or to alter a well-known tale, and to validate the allusion or alteration by virtue of the authority of the character. For example, we shall see how Callimachus changes a mythological story concerning Apollo, but validates this alteration by using the "voice" of the god himself. This technique of authorization also serves to underline the reflective nature of a particular poem.

The following exploration will begin with a summary of Callimachus' hymn, other occurrences of the same characters and stories predating this text, the manner in which Callimachus marks portions in his poem as allusive, and sections which detail how he alludes to two of his poetic predecessors in particular. The Ovidian part of this chapter will follow a similar organization, though, as will become evident,

(2003) recent study on Hellenistic poetry in which she examines Egyptian myth and literature within Callimachus' poetry.

Ovid alludes less discriminately to any particular poet than Callimachus.

An Overview of Callimachus' Hymn to Delos

Callimachus' fourth *Hymn*, the *Hymn to Delos*, the longest of the poet's collection of six, runs to 326 verses, adheres to its generic form, that of a monodic hymn, and possesses all the defining features of a hymn.[2] Greek hymns possess a tripartite structure consisting of a beginning, middle, and an end. The first part, the *invocatio* or *epiclesis*, establishes contact between the speaker of the hymn and the deity. In this portion there may be reference to the deity's names; attributes; genealogy; abodes or places of worship; and companion deities. The second part, known as the *eulogia*, may comprise predication of powers; anaphoric addresses; hypomneseis, or reminders of earlier benefits conferred; ecphraseis, or descriptions of the god, the god's actions and haunts; and the narrative.[3] After capturing the divinity's attention, in the final portion of the hymn the speaker turns to the request, or the prayer. Following the usual pattern, in the proem Callimachus specifies his intention to praise and the object of this praise, the *laudanda*, which is in this case the island of Delos. The main body of a hymn normally consists of a *descriptio* or a mythological *narratio*. Callimachus chooses the former for this hymn and, as is often the case,[4] features the *laudanda*'s birth. The final portion of the *Hymn to Delos* properly forms the epilogue; in this hymn the epilogue consists of a description of cultic practices, which are introduced by the preceding mythological narratives.

The primary concern of this chapter is the first two sections of the hymn. These may be subdivided and described as follows: verses 1-27 constitute the proem in which the speaker announces that Delos will be the object of his praise. In the second portion, verses 28-274, the *narratio*, the speaker describes the origin of the island and its pre-Apolline

---

[2] As Depew (1998), 160 has pointed out. The hymnic terminology used here is that of Miller (1986), 2-9. For further discussion of the components of a Greek hymn see Furley and Bremer (2001), 1-64, esp. 50-64. Other interpretations of this particular hymn's structure include: Mineur (1984), 3-9; Bing (1988), 146; and Schmiel (1987), 45-55.

[3] As Furley and Bremer (2001), 59, n. 176 point out, this list may be expanded.

[4] E.g. the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (1), *the Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (4), and the *Homeric Hymn to Dioscuri* (17).

existence. The speaker relates, in particular, the roaming of the island in the sea, Leto's search for a refuge in which to give birth, Delos' reception of Leto despite Hera's threats, and Apollo's birth.[5]

Other Occurrences of Asteria and Leto

Later in this chapter the importance of Asteria's story and her relationship to Leto will become clear. At this point, however, it would be helpful for the following examinations of the allusions to varying, and sometimes fragmentary, texts first to carefully lay out Callimachus' treatment of the scenes in which these mythological characters appear, and then to review occurrences of Asteria and Leto in Greek literature prior to *Hymn* 4.

The character of Asteria appears early in the hymn, within verses 28-274, where the poet tells how Delos (which the reader discovers is a name for Asteria, adopted later) came to be the seat of Apollo's worship and how Leto came to give birth to the god on this barren isle. The Callimachean narrator first explains how Poseidon fashioned all other islands (verses 30-35) and contrasts this with Delos's rootless, pre-Apolline existence (verses 35-36), her "old" name, Asteria (verse 37), and that she had become an island to escape the lust of Zeus (verses 37-38). The hymn's speaker then tells how the island became fixed in one place in the sea when it gave its soil to be the birthplace of Apollo (verses 51-54), and how the island faced Hera's anger when Leto was searching for a place to give birth (verses 55-69). In the lines that follow, the narrator lists the places which rejected Leto (verses 70-195), and in the process expands upon the stories of Thebes's rejection of Leto (and of the unborn Apollo's prophecy regarding this city) (verses 86-98), Leto's pleading with Peneius and his unexpected acceptance of her (verses 109-133), as well as her rejection of his sanctuary (verses 150-152). The unborn god makes another prophecy, this time a very positive one regarding the island of Cos, the birth of the second Ptolemy, and the attempted Celtic invasion. It is not until one hundred lines into the narrative proper, then, that the island Asteria offers a haven to the desperate Leto (verses 203-204), and when Hera relents (verses 240-248) the god Apollo is born (verses 249-274). The remain-

[5] Within this portion Callimachus has inserted (verses 160-190) still another hymn, a hymn to the island of Cos, within which he has placed a paean to Ptolemy II.

der of the hymn (verses 275-326) is devoted to references to various cultic practices in Delos.

Of all the stories recounted and alluded to in this hymn those of Asteria (or Delos, as the island is better known) and Leto will be the focus of this chapter. Prior to Callimachus' fourth *Hymn* only two extant poetic texts describe Leto's search for a birthplace for her children.[6] The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is chronologically the first of these. In this hymn, which seems to have been one of Callimachus sources, verses 30-50 detail the numerous places that reject the pregnant Leto.[7] In verses 51-89 Leto promises Delos great honors if she will allow Apollo to be born on her surface, and Delos accepts. After nine days of labor and Iris' fetching of Eilithyia, Leto gives birth to Apollo on the island of Delos (verses 90-122, the god is actually born at verse 119).[8]

Pindar is the only other extant poet prior to Callimachus whose work repeatedly alludes to various points of this story. It occurs in his *Hymn to Zeus* (Frr. 33c-33d) in which, as part of a wedding song for Cadmus and Harmonia, the Muses sing a theogony in which the birth of their leader, Apollo, on Delos/Asteria is one of the themes. In keep-

---

[6] For all occurrences of Asteria, Delos, and Leto in ancient literature see Roscher (1884-1937), 655-656; 984-985; and 1959-1971 (esp. 1959-1964) respectively; and Gantz (1993), 37-40; 88-89; 536-540. Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* provides notable prose accounts: 1.2.2; 1.4.1.

[7] It does not lie within the domain of this chapter to solve or even document the vexed problem of whether the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* was considered one or two hymns in the Hellenistic period. It is clear that Callimachus made a distinction in the hymn and alluded to the Delian portion of it in this hymn and to the Pythian portion in his own *Hymn to Apollo* (*Hymn II*). For one view see Miller (1986), who has argued for its unity. For the purpose of this discussion it is sufficient to note that Callimachus seems to distinguish between the two portions since this hymn is filled with references primarily to the *Hymn to Delian Apollo* (though, as will be discussed, Callimachus does allude to the Pythian portion as well), while the second *Hymn* makes use of the Pythian. In this discussion I shall refer to both parts as simply the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. See Bing (1988), 91; Mineur (1984), 95-96; Haslam (1993), 117-118; and Depew (1998), 155; 160-162. Callimachus' use of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* will be discussed below in much greater detail.

[8] Leto's wandering and Apollo's birth are also recounted in Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* 1.4.1. Hera hunted Leto all over the earth because of her affair with Zeus. She came to Delos and gave birth first to Artemis, then to Apollo. This portion of the *Bibliotheca* cannot be dated with certainty. Most of the *Bibliotheca* is thought to belong to the first or second century AD. In his *Met.* 6.188-91, Ovid briefly tells of Latona's search and Delos' acceptance of her within the story of Niobe. Both of these stories will be examined below. Occurrences of this story which post-date Ovid include Hyginus *Fab.* 9; 53; 55; 140; Libanius *Narr.* 25 (ed. Foester vol. VIII); Anton. Liberalis *Met.* 35.

ing with Pindar's style, this version is highly compressed. The poet tells us that the birthplace of Leto's children is called "Delos" by mortals and "far-seen star of the dark earth" by the immortals (*ἄν τε βροτοί / Δᾶλον κικλήσκοισιν, μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ / τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον*; "the mortals call her Delos / conspicuous by name, and the blessed ones on Olympus call her far-seen star of the dark earth" [Pindar Fr. 33c.4-6]); and that the island used to be carried on the waves by gusts of wind (Pindar Fr. 33d.1-3), but that as soon as Leto set foot on it, she gained an anchor in the form of four golden pillars which keep her in one place (Pindar Fr. 33d.3-9). In the extant fragments of *Paean* 5 the poet uses a highly compact phrase to allude to the entire myth surrounding Asteria (*Ἀστερίας δέμας*; "the body of Asteria"; Pindar *Paean* 5.42). In the less compressed but highly fragmentary *Paean* 7b he once more refers to Asteria's escape from an amorous Zeus (Pindar *Paean* 7b.42-47), and writes that the sailors of old called her Ortygia (Pindar *Paean* 7b.48), and that as an island she was carried upon the Aegean until Leto needed a birthplace for Apollo (Pindar *Paean* 7b.49-51). Finally, in the twelfth *Paean* Pindar once more refers to the birth of Apollo and Artemis (Pindar *Paean* 12.14-16), but in this version Zeus witnesses their birth (Pindar *Paean* 12.9-14).

As usual, it is difficult to determine whose work might have influenced Callimachus' or precisely to whose work the poet makes reference. In the case of this hymn, however, we are not at a complete loss. The following sections will make clear that in his characters of Asteria/Delos and Leto, and in his own particular rendition of their fate, the poet makes reference to these extant poetic versions. He makes references to both the Homeric and Pindaric tradition in forging a poem that lies at once within and outside these traditions.

Callimachus' Hymn to Delos*, the Hymnic Tradition, and the* Homeric Hymn to Apollo

As discussed earlier,[9] Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 possesses all the features of a traditional Greek hymn. Precisely what is this hymn's relationship to some of the most famous hymns, the *Homeric Hymns*? It seems clear that unlike most extant Greek hymns Callimachus' were not written for

[9] See p. 113.

cultic performance, but in imitation of this situation. While the surviving *Homeric Hymns* were indeed performed, usually as preludes to competitive recitals of epic poetry,[10] [these hymns, like] those of Callimachus, were more literary than devotional, and myth was their chief feature.[11] Like the *Homeric Hymns*, *Hymn* 4 is hexametric and a great portion of its language is epic.[12] Though the reader may think Callimachus' hymning of the island of Apollo's birth odd, he should keep in mind that a significant proportion of surviving Greek cult hymns celebrate Apollo and his related deities at Delphi and Delos, and "time and again it is the Delian 'trinity' of Apollo-Artemis-Leto (combined sometimes with the island of Delos itself) which receives hymnic worship at Delos itself and in external texts relating to Delos".[13] The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* in particular, on which Callimachus relied for his *Hymn to Delos*, narrates the "charter myth' in the Delian context".[14]

It is also important to keep in mind the Hellenistic scholars', as well as the Hellenistic poets', relationship to the poetry of the past. In this discussion of hymns in particular we should remember that "we may attribute separate books of types of hymns by Pindar and Bacchylides [for example] to Alexandrian classification..." and that "any composition was identified [by Alexandrian scholars] by compositional features as a dithyramb, paian or parthenion, etc. and classified accordingly; the remainder, which defied specific classification, was put into a book called 'hymns', but actually was equivalent to 'miscellaneous hymns".[15] Therefore Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 possesses a scholarly and poetic relationship to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo,* which will be explored below.

To underscore his reliance upon the hymnic genre Callimachus makes what may be called integrative allusions to the general form by incorporating several generic signatures of this genre into his poem.[16] If the reader has worked his way chronologically through Callimachus' collection of hymns, he will have encountered one of the mimetic

---

[10] Furley and Bremer (2001), 41.
[11] Guthrie (1970), 534.
[12] Mineur (1984), 19.
[13] Furley and Bremer (2001), 35-36, and n. 109.
[14] Furley and Bremer (2001), 102.
[15] Furley and Bremer (2001), 11, and n. 38.
[16] Haslam (1993), 117; Mineur (1984), 106-107, and relevant sections of commentary; and Depew (1998), 106.

hymns, the *Hymn to Apollo,*[17] and he is aware that the poet is liable to supplement the traditional and expected with “the unusual” or “the unexpected”. This being the case, the fact that this hymn’s meter is hexameter, the meter of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, announces a certain allegiance to the genre of the hexameter hymn.[18] This, combined with the fact that *Hymn* 4 possesses all the features of a hexameter hymn indicates to the reader that this poem might adhere to other hymnic conventions.

More specifically, Callimachus clearly models the intention and form of his narrative on that of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. The Hellenistic and *Homeric Hymns* accomplish their primary goal, i.e. to praise, by narrating accounts of Apollo’s birth via aetiological stories.[19] The culmination of Callimachus’ hymn, a description of ritual celebrations on Delos (verses 275-326) is closely modeled on the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, since Callimachus connects ancient myth and contemporary ritual just as the Homeric text does (verses 140-164 and verses 475-525; verses 532-544 respectively).

Just when the reader allows that this poem might follow the course of a traditional hymn, the poet inserts the unanticipated. By alluding integratively to hymnic conventions Callimachus suggests that his poem is to be considered part of the Greek hymnic tradition. But he simultaneously contrasts the central subject matter of his own hymn with the more traditional hymnic subject matter by constructing reflective lexical allusions to his antecedents, particularly the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo.*[20] In the older hymn, the god’s birth is preceded by the poet’s uncertainty of how to celebrate the divinity given the number of possibilities (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 19): Πῶς τάρ σ’ ὑμνήσω πάντως εὔυμνον ἐόντα (“How will I celebrate you in song, you who are altogether celebrated in hymns?”); Callimachus alludes to this with verses 28-29: εἰ δὲ λίην πολέες σε περιτροχόωσιν ἀοιδαί, / ποίῃ ἐνιπλέξω σε;

[17] The reader, making his way through the entire collection of hymns, will soon discover that there are two more mimetic hymns in Callimachus’ collection, namely the fifth and sixth *Hymns*.

[18] Depew (1998), 165. Throughout this section Depew (1998) has proved most helpful. The reader must read the hymn following this one, *Hymn* 5, to see that Callimachus uses elegiac distichon for this genre.

[19] E.g. as Depew (1998), 160-162. The first-person verb is most usual, but naturally the poet adds his own flourish by varying the convention, adding θυμός in the second person.

[20] Bing (1988), 111-112 has treated these as parallels, but he does not define or examine these allusions as reflective.

τί τοι θυμῆρες ἀκοῦσαι; ("If very many songs run around you, with what will I entwine you? What is pleasing for you to hear?"). Haslam has pointed out the humorousness of this reference; how much hymnic material does the island itself offer?[21] In the earlier piece the poet segues to his chosen theme with the words (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 25): *ἦ ὥς σε πρῶτον Λητὼ τέκε, χάρμα βροτοῖσι* ("Shall I sing how first Leto bore you, a joy for mortals?"). Callimachus recalls but alters this with his (*Hymn* 4.30-32): *ἢ ὡς τὰ πρώτιστα μέγας θεὸς οὔρεα θείνων / ἄορι τριγλώχινι τό οἱ* Τελχῖνες *ἔτευξαν / νήσους εἰναλίας εἰργάζετο* ("How first the great god, striking the mountains with the three-forked sword which the Telchines fashioned for him, created the islands of the sea?"). The poet then corrects himself, telling the reader that this was not how Asteria/Delos was 'born'. Still, this reference is remarkable given that *ἦ ὥς* as an introductory formula together with some form of *πρῶτον* appear in early hexameter poetry only in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, where it appears twice: once to introduce the Delian (verse 25) and once to introduce the Pythian section (verse 214).[22]

These introductory, lexically-based reflective allusions anticipate the reflective allusions Callimachus makes to traditional stories associated with Apollo and his birth as well as with the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* in particular. When the reader considers the *Hymn to Delos* as a whole, he probably notes that, generally speaking, the stories treated in Callimachus' hymn recall those of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: Leto's search for a birthing place; Delos' acceptance of Leto; and the birth of Apollo. Beyond this, the first impression may be that only the *laudandae* are dissimilar. If the reader remembers the text of the *Hymn to Apollo*, however, he sees that Callimachus alludes reflectively, not lexically, in the treatment of the stories of his hymn. One example of this is the portion of *Hymn* 4 extensively detailing various regions and cities that reject the pregnant Leto (verses 70-195), which reflects on and contrasts with the comparatively short description of Leto's wandering in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (verses 30-48). Here Callimachus outstrips his Homeric precedent in sheer quantity of verses. The reader might speculate that one reason for this may be to simply revitalize a traditional story; another may be to highlight Delos' courageousness in accepting Leto in the face of Hera' s wrath.

---

[21] Haslam (1993), 117 has observed "Delos offers less material than any god, with but a single claim to fame".

[22] As Bing (1988), 112 points out.

As discussed above, Callimachus' integrative allusions authenticate his *Hymn to Delos* as belonging to the hymnic tradition. The reader notices, however, that though the tales recounted in the fourth hymn are generally similar to those of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, several elements of these tales are markedly different from the Homeric models. These alterations are, perhaps not surprisingly, points at which Callimachus makes reflective allusions to both the Delian and Pythian sections of the hymn to Apollo. These allusions are not lexical, but refer to the tradition as recorded in the *Homeric Hymns* and, curiously enough, occur within the portions of *Hymn* 4 that quote characters. The reader does not immediately doubt the veracity of the speaker, whether it be Apollo, Asteria/Delos, or Leto, because of the character's identity. It is not surprising that Callimachus alters elements of traditional tales; what may be unexpected is that the poet alters the tales and at the same time authenticates them by placing his modifications within the mouths of characters whose utterances seem credible. Only after the alterations are identified as such by a recollection of the Homeric precedents are the reflective allusions revealed.

One half of Callimachus' allusive technique to mythological tales associated with Apollo is similar to a technique employed by a poet to whom, as we have seen, he frequently alludes: Homer. At several points within speeches in the *Iliad* a character exhorts or consoles another character using a *paradeigma*. This *paradeigma* takes the form of ring-composition, and the parallels between the mythological story invoked and the immediate situation in the poem often appear to be fabricated to some extent.[23] A relatively simple example of Homer's inventiveness within the framework of a traditional story is one to which we will return later in this chapter: the Niobe-*paradeigma,* which Achilles employs in the final book of the *Iliad* (24. 601-619). To encourage Priam to eat before taking his son's body back to Troy,

[23] Willcock (1964), 141-154, who in addition to the *paradeigma* of Niobe explores those of Nestor at 1.259-274; Achilles at 1.393-407; Agamemnon at 4.370-400; Dione at 5.382-404; Nestor once more at 7.124-160; Thetis at 18.394-405; and Meleager at 9.524-605. Given his position in western literature it may seem odd to discuss alterations Homer may have made to a particular tradition, but several tales employed by Homer and examined by Willcock (and others, ancient and modern) appear suspect in their details and smack of exaggeration or other alteration, so it is not unreasonable to discuss changes the poet may have made to tradition. Furthermore, we currently believe that Homer was one in a long line of oral poets who must have improvised. See also Andersen (1987), 1-13, who examines Homer's *paradeigmata* through the filter of more modern literary theory.

Achilles tells him that after the death of her children, Niobe ate. Niobe's situation is very like Priam's, perhaps even worse; Niobe lost 12 children, not one, and even she ate. Though the traditional myth of Niobe describes the loss of many children, there is no evidence, except in Homer, that she ate.[24] Furthermore, to parallel the unburied body of Hector, Achilles tells Priam that Niobe's children were left unburied because Zeus turned the people to stone (*Il.* 24.611). This is a second detail in the story, crucial for the effectiveness of the *paradeigma* that the poet altered. Homer often did not choose a suitable mythological story, but invented at least some aspects of it to suit his poetic needs.

So too does it seem that within his *Hymn* 4 Callimachus not only changed or invented details of mythological stories associated with Apollo, but that like Homer he places these alterations of the tradition within the mouths of characters the reader does not immediately question because these characters were actually present. These alterations then urge the reader to recall the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, and ultimately construct a dialogue between the Homeric and Callimachean texts. One example of this occurs at verses 86-99. Verses 86-87 *ταῖς μὲν ἔτ' Ἀπόλλων ὑποκόλπιος αἰνά χολώθη, / φθέγξατο δ' οὐκ ἀτέλεστον ἀπειλήσας ἐπὶ Θήβῃ* ("And still in his mother's womb Apollo was terribly angry with them and he uttered against Thebe a threat not without effect") prompt the reader to accept all that is stated on the god's authority. In this scene the unborn Apollo refers to his future deed of slaying Python and the establishment of his oracle, as well as his future recognition as the warrior god who brings death from afar with his bow. The reader, however, must be taken aback by Callimachus' ultra-precocious god prophesying. This is a reflective allusion to the merely precocious Homeric Apollo, who must first be born before uttering his intentions (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 131-132) *εἴη μοι κίθαρίς τε φίλη καὶ καμπύλα τόξα, / χρήσω δ' ἀνθρώποισι Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν* ("The lyre and the curved bow will be dear to me, and I will declare to men the unfailing will of Zeus"). Here the Homeric god, chronologically the "first" in the literary tradition, shortly after his birth announces that the areas of music, archery, and prophecy will be his domains. Callimachus' Apollo compels the reader to recall this, the god's 'first' announcement. When the Homeric and Callimachean texts are compared the reader realizes that Callimachus' divinity playfully

[24] Some later authors, such as Lucian *de Luctu* 24, do include these details when quoting Homer.

outstrips the Apollo of his predecessor: the Callimachean Apollo does not simply announce his ability to prophesy, but does it *in utero*.[25] Thus Callimachus records Apollo's "true" first announcement and by placing it within the god's mouth, the reader cannot question the unborn god's statement.

The author suggests that the focus of this scene, however, is also on Apollo's warning Thebes of its future slanderous queen, i.e. Niobe. The reader may recall that nowhere in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is there a reference to Niobe or Thebes' rejection of Leto. Callimachus may have added the scene to balance and contrast with that of Peneius' acceptance of Leto and her rejection of him as a haven (*Hymn* 4.109-152), which occurs some verses later. What the reader must note is that the Niobe story does not occur in the *Homeric Hymn*, and though Thebes is indeed mentioned in the Pythian portion of the hymn, it is described as not yet in existence (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 225-228). Whether or not Callimachus based his version upon that of another is unclear, but the reader first accepts the god's announcements as true because the god himself utters them, and is then compelled to compare the Homeric Apollo to the Callimachean. The final effect is that the Callimachean authority contrasts with that of the Homeric text.

Only a few verses later Callimachus again calls upon the authority of divinities to validate his innovations: Leto's emotional interchange with Peneius, verses 109-116; verses 122-132; and verses 150-152, in which Leto pleads with Peneius for refuge. Though the river god fears Hera's reprisals, he accepts Leto only to be rejected thankfully by Leto. When the reader turns to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* he finds that this episode is 'missing'. In fact, Leto's appeal to Peneius has no known precedent, though it may serve as a counterpart to the Thebes-Niobe scene and to underscore the importance of Peneius in relation to Apollo.[26] This Callimachean innovation also sends the reader back to the general mythic tradition surrounding Apollo, where it is not found. Thus the authenticated words of Peneius and Leto constitute a

[25] The precociousness of divine babies is well known, but the idea of an "articulate foetus" seems completely new and must have surprised the Hellenistic reader. See Mineur (1984), 120.

[26] See Mineur (1984), 133. The Peneius region is the *locus* of some of Apollo's future love affairs such as Daphne and Cyrene (Ovid *Met*. 1.452; Hesiod Fr. 215 and Pindar *Paean* 9.4ff; respectively). See also McKay (1962b), 153-154. After slaying the Python the god purified himself in Peneius' stream, and Peneius was the grandfather of Cyrene, the eponymous nymph of Callimachus' native city.

reflective allusion to all traditional stories associated with Apollo as well as those of the *Homeric Hymns* to the god.

The motif of a divinity speaking to a potential haven appears one last time in Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 at verses 196-205. To emphasize the heroic nature of Asteria/Delos, the object of his hymn, the poet depicts the wandering island as immediately, unreluctantly, and unbidden, accepting Leto: "*Ἥρη, τοῦτό με ῥέξον ὅ τοι φίλον· οὐ γὰρ ἀπειλὰς / ὑμετέρας ἐφύλαξα· πέρα, πέρα εἰς ἐμὲ Λητοῖ.*" ("'Hera, do what you want to me; I do not observe your threats. Leto, cross, cross over to me.'" *Hymn* 4.203-204) This brief statement contrasts with his own depiction of Thebes and Peneius, both of whom the reader remembers are Callimachean innovations that allude to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, and it alludes reflectively to the relatively business-like, *quid pro quo* exchange between the Homeric Leto and Delos (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 51-89). The authority of the statement of Callimachus' Asteria/Delos has the effect of underlining the nobility of Delos, of alluding reflectively to the Homeric Delos, and of superseding it.

Callimachus concludes this series of reflective allusions to the traditional stories found in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* with two more modifications. At verses 215-231 Callimachus humorously characterizes Iris, describing her before she delivers her message to Hera as *τοίη σε προσέδραμεν ἀγγελιῶτις, / εἶπε δ' ἔτ' ἀσθμαίνουσα, φόβῳ δ' ἀνεμίσγετο μῦθος* ("Such a messanger ran up to you, and breathing heavily she spoke and her speech was mingled with fear"; *Hymn* 4.216-217), and, after the message has been delivered, as *ἦ καὶ ὑπὸ χρύσειον ἑδέθλιον ἵζε κύων ὥς, /Ἀρτέμιδος ἥτις τε, θοῆς ὅτε παύσεται ἄγρης, /ἵζει θηρήτειρα παρ' ἴχνεσιν, οὔατα δ' αὐτῆς /ὀρθὰ μάλ', αἰὲν ἑτοῖμα θεῆς ὑποδέχθαι ὀμοκλήν* ("Thus she spoke and she seated herself beside the golden throne like a hound of Artemis which, when it has stopped the swift chase, the huntress sits by her feet, and its ears erect, always ready to receive the call of the goddess." *Hymn* 4.228-231).[27] The reader discovers that Callimachus' Iris is rather unbecomingly sycophantic. In the prelude of her report to Hera she subjugates herself completely to her (*Hymn* 4.218-220), and a few verses on, anticipating the anger of the queen of the gods, calls Asteria the "evil scum of the

[27] Haslam (1993), 117 points out that, oddly enough, Artemis does not make an appearance here except in this simile. Perhaps too with this simile Callimachus refers to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*'s inclusion of the twin goddess. In that hymn, however, Artemis is said to have been born on Ortygia (verses 15-6).

sea" (*Hymn* 4.225). In this passage the poet has so skillfully characterized Iris that the reader at first does not question the veracity of this portion of the story. The careful reader detects, however, Callimachus' alteration and reflective allusion disguised within the messenger goddess' own words. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* Iris plays the role of Leto's *helper*; in that hymn the goddesses call upon her to fetch Eilithyia, who sits at Hera's side, so that Apollo may be born (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 102-112).

Finally, Callimachus portrays Hera as forgiving—for rather amusing reasons—at verses 239-248. The queen of the gods curses all of her husband's lovers (*Hymn* 4.239-242), but unexpectedly, given the number of verses leading up to this moment that have dealt directly or indirectly with Hera's anger, relents and says (*Hymn* 4.244-249):

Ἀστερίῃ δ᾽ οὐδέν τι βαρύνομαι εἵνεκα τῆσδε
ἀμπλακίης, οὐδ᾽ ἔστιν ὅπως ἀποθύμια ῥέξω,
τόσσα δέοι (μάλα γάρ τε κακῶς ἐχαρίσσατο Λητοῖ)·

ἀλλά μιν ἔκπαγλόν τι σεβίζομαι, οὕνεκ᾽ ἐμεῖο
δέμνιον οὐκ ἐπάτησε, Διὸς δ᾽ ἀνθείλετο πόντον."
ἡ μὲν ἔφη·

But I am not at all angry with Asteria because of
this sin, and there is no way in which I will do her
a disfavour, as I should (for very wrongly has she
done Leto a favor), but I honor her exceedingly because
she did not trample on my bed, but preferred the sea
to Zeus. Thus she spoke.

The reader may not immediately doubt the goddess' words, but once the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is recalled, Callimachus' characterization contrasts with that unrelenting Homeric Hera who sits alone, jealous and contriving, with Eilithyia on Olympus (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* verses 92-101).

In these six scenes, which are inserted throughout the poem, Callimachus has authenticated alterations or inventions he has made to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* by incorporating the alterations into the direct speech of divinities. The reader may not immediately doubt the word of such characters, but once he recalls the Homeric precedents, he notices the alterations and the reflective allusions the poet makes. Callimachus' Apollo, in comparison with the god of the *Homeric Hymn*, is even more precocious, uttering prophecies before his own birth. The Callimachean Delos is more assertive; once she ascertains

the problem, she immediately approaches Leto and offers her haven. The 'straight' Iris of the *Homeric Hymn* becomes a comic aid to the conniving Hera, who in turn, quite unexpectedly forgives her rival, the *laudanda* of the hymn.

These playful and humorous references that simultaneously help authenticate and set the "old" and "new" texts side by side soon give way to a more dramatic divergence from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, namely a shift in the hymn's focus from praise of a divinity to praise of the island of the divinity's birth. The central aim of the *Homeric Hymn* is to praise the god, while the Hellenistic poet has shifted the focus of the hymn to praise the god indirectly, and the island of the god's birth directly.[28] Having seen the poet adhere to hymnic convention, this trope is unexpected, and all other shifts he makes in the tradition proceed from this.

In fact, once the Homeric and Callimachean texts are considered more carefully, we see that Callimachus has completely altered the *Homeric Hymn*'s pacing and motivation. As Depew and Mineur have noticed, Callimachus uses and amplifies aspects not developed or entirely missing from the Homeric poem. For example, in the Homeric antecedent the wrath of Hera is relatively unimportant, but Callimachus transforms this element into the driving force of his narrative.[29] Callimachus expands the *Homeric Hymn*'s nineteen verses of Leto's wandering (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 30-48) to one hundred and forty (*Hymn* 4.68-204), and the Callimachean wanderings of Asteria parallel those of Leto. Both constitute a dominant theme not evident in the *Homeric Hymn*.[30] Ultimately in his fourth *Hymn* Callimachus devalues Apollo's birth—it comprises only four lines. The relationship between the isle Asteria/Delos and Leto is given more attention than the relationship of either to Apollo, because, after all, as the poet announces, this is a hymn for Delos.

[28] Depew (1998), 162.

[29] Depew (1998), 162, also n. 21, as well as Mineur (1984), 95-96.

[30] Haslam (1993), 118 suggests that the wanderings of the island and Leto in this hymn function as strophe and antistrophe. Depew (1998), 166 sees the entire section of Leto being rejected by various places as alluding to and correcting the *Homeric Hymn*: "the locations are intimidated by Hera (not Apollo, as in the *Homeric Hymn*) and her two minions." Further, the "surreal quality of this account goes hand in hand with the artifice of multiple reference", i.e. the reference to several poets simultaneously. Mineur (1984), 218 believes that this section of the hymn displays "geographical anarchy".

Callimachus' adoption of the generic signatures of the hymnic genre, which could be considered integrative allusions, such as the use of hexameter and standard portions of a monodic hymn, serves to authenticate his text as a hymn. But the poet alters his allusive technique when he alludes reflectively to one specific hymn, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Then these localized, lexical allusions give way to overt thematic reflective allusions, allusions that point out Callimachus' shift in his hymn's focus and his alteration of the *Homeric Hymn*'s pacing and motivation.[31]

Callimachus' Hymn to Delos *and Pindar's Poetry*

Callimachus relied upon integrative allusions to the hymnic tradition in general to authenticate his own hymn, and he relied specifically upon the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* as a medium of contrast, but he also owed as great a debt to the poetry of Pindar.[32] At first glance it seems that Callimachus' portrayal of Asteria/Delos is thematically so similar to that of Pindar that his allusions to Pindar's poetry may be classified as integrative, and that the single image the allusions create is best released when the reader recognizes the interdependence of the two texts. Though the Hellenistic poet has indeed incorporated Pindar's exceptional portrayal of the island into his own almost entirely, the alert reader detects that Callimachus slightly alters the Pindaric portrayal of the island. Thus ultimately the allusions are reflective, but less obviously so than discussed previously in this study. What is furthermore remarkable is that these subtle reflective allusions, which gently alter the predecessor, run alongside the more obvious reflective references Callimachus makes to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.

We have seen that Callimachus shifted the focus of his hymn from Apollo to Delos. In order to more effectively transmute and draw out a contrast between his own text and the *Homeric Hymn* Callimachus uses other narratives,[33] specifically a character absent from the *Homeric*

[31] See Haslam (1993), 119 who writes that Callimachus "only draws attention to the difference between this hymn and the other". Depew (1998), 174 believes that Callimachus' allusions to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* are overt. For a different view see Reinsch-Werner (1976).

[32] For the influence of Pindar's poetry upon Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 see Bing (1988), 96-110; Depew (1998), 155-82; Smiley (1919), 46-72; and M. Poliakoff (1980), 41-47.

[33] See also Bing (1988), 96, who describes Callimachus' allusions to Pindar as "more thematic than verbatim".

Hymn in one incarnation, but central in connection with Delos and Apollo in Pindar's work: Asteria.[34] She is the nymph who fled the embrace of Zeus by jumping into the sea where she then became a floating island, later called Delos.

As discussed in an earlier section, there are four texts of Pindar that, usually in a highly compressed manner, mention Asteria, the deity's history as a nymph and as an island, Leto's search for a birthing-place, and the birth of Apollo. Of these four, three display a relationship to Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*, but before these are examined in more detail, it is important to note the genre of each. One text is a hymn, and therefore we may apply to this discussion what was discussed previously.[35] The remaining three belong to the species "paean", a species of the genus "hymn". Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* displays a relationship to the species paean first because of its connection to Apollo, though indirect, and secondly because of its relationship to three of Pindar's paeans. Originally the paean seems to have been a hymn addressed to Apollo in his role as healer, and almost all Apolline paeans refer to some specific religious center.[36] In the case of the Pindaric paeans we will examine below, each of them was most probably performed at Delos.[37] What is particularly important in the discussion of the relationship of Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 to Pindar's hymnic poetry is Rutherford's observation that "in classical poetry genre is intimately tied to function, although formal features also had a role and help to recreate an impression of the original performance scenario; but in post-classical poetry the burden of genre comes to rest on generic signatures and allusion."[38] In this discussion of the relationship of the *Hymn to Delos* to Pindar's paeans it is interesting to note that Callimachus does not employ the generic signatures of the paean, as does he of the hymnic generic in

[34] For the myth of Asteria see Roscher (1884-1937), 655-656 and Papastavrou (1984), 903-904.

[35] See pp. 116-117.

[36] Early on the paean was used for other purposes as well, such as military, sympotic ,and for public occasions. In the Hellenistic age paeans were addressed to successful individuals; paeans were by no means confined to Apollo, but were also addressed to Zeus, Poseidon, Dionysus, Asclepius, and Hygieia. Rutherford (2001), 24.

[37] See Rutherford (2001), 243-252 (*Paean* 7b); 293-298 (*Paean* 5); and 365-372 (*Paean* 12), which does not exhibit connections to Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*, and therefore is not examined in this chapter, but which does allude to Apollo's birth.

[38] As Rutherford (2001), 128 recently formulated the idea. To illustrate this point Rutherford examines Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* which, because it possesses many generic signatures of the paean, he classifies as a paean, 128-130. For the theory underpinning this statement see Gentili (1988) and Rösler (1980).

general. Instead, Callimachus appears to both ally and contrast his hymn with the traditional paean as represented by Pindar.

For the reader of Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* fragments 33c and 33d of Pindar's *Hymn to Zeus* may be familiar. These fragments constitute part of an epithalamium for Cadmus and Harmonia in which the Muses sing of the birth of their leader, Apollo. The beginning of the *narratio* of the *Hymn to Delos* hints that Callimachus had Pindar's poetry in mind when creating his own. Callimachus' direct address recalls the beginning of *Paean 5*, *ἰήιε Δάλι Ἄπολλον*, a phrase which constitutes one of the generic signatures of the paean.[39] Certainly, given that the central subject matter is the same, the direct address of the speaker of Callimachus' hymn, i.e., *σε* (*Hymn* 4.28), *σε...τοι* (*Hymn* 4.29), *σὲ* (*Hymn* 4.35), *σὺ* (*Hymn* 4.40), *σε* (*Hymn* 4.41), *σὺ* (*Hymn* 4.44), *σε* (*Hymn* 4.49), recalls the *Du-Stil* of Pindar's praise of Delos (Fr. 33c):[40]

> *χαῖρ', ὦ θεοδμάτα, λιπαροπλοκάμου*
> *παίδεσσι Λατοῦς ἱμεροέστατον ἔρνος,*
> *πόντου θύγατερ, χθονὸς εὐρεί-*
> *ας ἀκίνητον τέρας, ἅν τε βροτοί*
> *Δᾶλον κικλῄσκοισιν, μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ*
> *τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον.* (Fr. 33c)
>
> Hail, O heaven-built one, most lovely branch
> for the children of shining-haired Leto, O
> daughter of the sea, unmoved marvel of the
> broad earth, called Delos by mortal men,
> but by the blessed ones of Olympus known
> as the far-shown star of the dark-blue earth.....

Callimachus' hymn opens with the statement that the island had become Delos (*Hymn* 4.51-54), *ἡνίκα δ' Ἀπόλλωνι γενέθλιον οὖδας ὑπέσχες, / τοῦτό τοι ἀντημοιβὸν ἁλίπλοοι οὔνομ' ἔθεντο, / οὕνεκεν οὐκέτ' ἄδηλος ἐπέπλεες, ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντου / κύμασιν Αἰγαίοιο ποδῶν ἐνεθήκαο ῥίζας.* ("but when you gave your soil to be the birth-place of Apollo, seafaring men gave you this name in exchange, since no more did you float obscurely upon the water, but in the waves of the Aegean sea you planted the roots of your feet") These verses allude reflectively to one of Pindar's explanations of the island's name (*Paean* 7b.43-52):

---

[39] Depew (1998), 166. For the generic signatures of the paean see Rutherford (2001), 68-83.

[40] All translations of Pindar are those of Rutherford (2001), whose interpretions sometimes differ from those of Snell-Maehler.

ἧ Διὸς οὐκ ἐθέλο[ισα
Κοίου θυγάτηρ π[
ἄπιστά μ[ο]ι δέδο[ι]κα καμ[
δέ μιν ἐν πέλ[α]γ[ο]ς
ῥιφθεῖσαν εὐαγέα πέτραν φανῆναι
καλέοντί μιν Ὀρτυγίαν ναῦται πάλαι.
πεφόρητο δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ Αἰγαῖον θαμά·
τᾶς ὁ κράτιστος
ἐράσσατο μιχθείς
τοξοφόρον τελέσαι γόνον

That the daughter of Coeus was unwilling
to [enter the bed of Zeus, and fled to the sea.]
I fear that I am saying things unbelievable and
[unclear?]. But they say that she was flung into
the sea and appeared as a conspicuous rock. Sailors
have long called it Ortygia. It often traveled
over the Aegean, until the strongest one desired
to unite with her and produce arrow-bearing offspring.

Callimachus has incorporated the Pindaric notion that the island drifted in the sea until the god was born on it. Note that while Callimachus retains the Pindaric motif of the wandering island, he alters the Pindar's *Ὀρτυγίαν*, only hinting at one of its other names with the word *ἄδηλος*.[41] Callimachus repeatedly employs the theme of the nymph's/island's physical transformation evident in Pindar's *Paeans*, but alters details. For instance, Callimachus (*Hymn* 4.36-38): *οὔνομα δ᾽ ἦν τοι / Ἀστερίη τὸ παλαιόν, ἐπεὶ βαθὺν ἥλαο τάφρον / οὐρανόθεν φεύγουσα Διὸς γάμον ἀστέρι ἴση* ("and your old name was Asteria since you leapt like a star from heaven into the deep moat, fleeing wedlock with Zeus") alludes to and expands upon Pindar's *Ἀστερίας δέμας*, "the outward form of Asteria" (*Paean* 5.42),[42] as well as verses

---

[41] In antiquity, especially in poetry, the island we now know as Delos had other names. See Gantz (1993), 40.

[42] Farnell (1932) and Bing (1988), 99 see these two words as a compressed reference to the entire story. Farnell points out, based on *P.Oxy.* 841, Fr. 18,19, that Pindar was aware of the legend of Asteria's rejection of Zeus, and as a penalty was cast into the sea and changed into a rock (as the extant version in Hyginus *Fab.* 53 tells us). Farnell (1932), Wilamowitz (1922), 328, n. 2, and more recently Rutherford (2001), 250-51 agree the "most probable interpretation of the mutilated text is that Pindar rejected the story as incredible and degrading" (Farnell). Mineur (1984) 83-84, however, points out that in Callimachus' version of Asteria's physical transformation there is no trace of Apollodorus's version (1.4.1), in which Asteria was transformed into a quail after her jump from heaven. This version of the nymph's metamorphosis does not explicitly occur in Pindar's texts either.

46-48 of *Paean* 7b. Judging by the brevity of both poets' verses it seems that they assume their readers to be familiar with this aspect of the island's history. Notice, however, that Callimachus modifies the Pindaric version: his Asteria actively chooses to escape Zeus, *ἥλαο*, whereas Pindar's nymph is passively flung, *ῥιφθεῖσαν*. As we shall see below, Callimachus alludes to many aspects of his Pindaric source, but repeatedly emphasizes the autonomy, both literal and literary, of his Asteria.

Both poets play on the theme of physical transformation by lingering over how, once an island, it metamorphoses from a free-floating to a fixed entity. This idea is absent from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*; Pindar's is the first known account in which Delos was once a free-floating isle.[43] Once more, however, the reader notices that in Pindar's account (Fr. 33d.5-9) the island is passive, acted upon; four columns rise out of the earth and fix it firmly:

> *δὴ τότε τέσσαρες ὀρθαί*
> *πρέμνων ἀπώρουσαν χθονίων,*
> *ἂν δ' ἐπικράνοις σχέθον*
> *πέτραν ἀδαμαντοπέδιλοι*
> *κίονες, ἔνθα τεκοῖ-*
> *σ' εὐδαίμον' ἐπόψατο γένναν.*
>
> then it was that the four upright pillars
> with adamantine bases rose from the roots
> of the earth, and on their capitals, held up
> the rock, where she gave birth, and beheld
> her blessed offspring……

As Bing has pointed out, Pindar's island is exclusively on the receiving end, and the words *θεοδμάτα* (Fr. 33c1), a "divine foundation", and therefore *ἀκίνητον* (Fr. 33c4), "immoveable" underscore this notion.[44] Callimachus alludes reflectively to this tradition, apparently established by Pindar, of the additional dimension of the unfixed and fixed states of the island. While Callimachus integrates into his hymn the portrayal of the island as once free but now fixed in the ocean, he alters it slightly by portraying an island which gives itself to Leto of her own free will; she becomes fixed in the earth as the result of her own choice. The island drifted unfettered on the sea (*Hymn* 4.35-36); she

---

[43] Mineur (1984), 82-83 states Callimachus' *ἄφετος πελάγεσσιν* (*Hymn* 4.36) suggests an allusion to Pindar's *φορητὰ κυμάτεσσιν* (Fr. 33d 1-2).

[44] Bing (1988), 106.

gave her soil to be Apollo's birthplace and she planted roots in the ocean (*Hymn* 4.51-54); finally, the island sympathized with Leto and invited her onto her surface (*Hymn* 4.202-203).

Nominal mutability is another theme apparently introduced by Pindar into this nexus of tales that Callimachus incorporates into his poem and to which he alludes reflectively. As discussed previously, the *narratio* of his hymn opens with the statement that the island has become Delos (*Hymn* 4.51-54): *ἡνίκα δ' Ἀπόλλωνι γενέθλιον οὖδας ὑπέσχες, / τοῦτό τοι ἀντημοιβὸν ἁλίπλοοι οὔνομ' ἔθεντο,/ οὕνεκεν οὐκέτ' ἄδηλος ἐπέπλεες, ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντου / κύμασιν Αἰγαίοιο ποδῶν ἐνεθήκαο ῥίζας.* ("but when you gave your soil to be the birth-place of Apollo, seafaring men gave you this name in exchange, since no more did you float obscurely upon the water, but in the waves of the Aegean sea you planted the roots of your feet"). While obviously a pun on the island's name, this refers to the island's name, Delos, "clearly seen," in Pindar's *Paean* 7b.47 *εὐαγέα πέτραν*.[45] In his *Hymn to Zeus* Pindar's island possesses two names, both relating to visibility and both existing simultaneously, one "mortal" and one "immortal," *Δᾶλον* ("clearly seen"; Fr. 33c.5) and *τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον*, ("far-shown star of the dark-blue earth"; Fr. 33c.6).[46] Further, he uses *ἄστρον* in depicting the first stage of the island's existence, her life as a nymph who fled Zeus. This story is more explicitly referred to at *Paean* 5.42.[47] Here too Pindar takes advantage of the etymological aspect the name affords him.[48] If *τηλέφαντον...ἄστρον* (Fr. 33c5), means "far-seen" and is a play on the word *δῆλος* or *δᾶλος*, "conspicuous," the name humans use for the island, then the immortal and mortal names are virtually glosses.[49] Both poets' play on *ἀστήρ* and *ἄστρον* is further complicated by the form used by each. Though both forms are evocative of "Asteria", there is an important distinction; both are used of a fixed star, but the former (*ἀστήρ*) is used of a shooting star as well. Because Pin-

---

[45] Depew (1998), 166 and n. 26.

[46] Depew (1998), 165; Bing (1988), 101-03.

[47] Depew (1998), 165 and n. 27, and Bing (1988), 100 also see the "paradoxical juxtapositions" in the *Hymn to Zeus* (Fr. 33c-33d) namely *θεοδμάτα*, used for massive, man-made structures, "sprout," a small, organic structure, the "daughter of the sea floating freely in the sea" versus "earth's immoveable wonder," *τέρας* among islands, as further reinforcing the notion of the island's double life.

[48] Some scholars have been hesitant to connect these words with the island's former name; e.g. Slater (1969) and Mineur (1984), 83-84. Pindar describes the island of Aegina as a star also, but here the poet explicitly distinguishes, calling the island a "far-*seen* star."

[49] As Bing (1988) has pointed out.

dar seems chiefly concerned with the fixed nature of Delos, *ἀκίνητον τέρας*, *ἄστρον* is the appropriate word. Callimachus uses *ἀστήρ* to subtly accentuate the peregrinations of his island, which in turn effectively parallels the early wanderings of Leto. So here again Callimachus blends a slight alteration into his ultimately reflective reference to Pindar.

Callimachus makes a reflective allusion to Pindar's use of two names to identify the island by two different names. In his *Hymn to Zeus* Pindar writes that the island possesses two names; mortals call her Delos, while the immortals refer to her as "the far-shown star of the dark-blue earth" (Fr. 33c): *ἅν τε βροτοί / Δᾶλον κικλήσκοισιν, μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ / τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον*. Callimachus modifies his predecessor's time frame: it is called one name before and another after the birth of Apollo and this reflects its evolution from one existence to another (*Hymn* 4.36-40 and 51-54).[50] Callimachus' etymology of these names recalls and modifies the Pindaric etymology. The reader sees that once Apollo was born on the island, it became fixed and sailors renamed it "Delos" since it no longer floated *ἄδηλος*, obscurely, in the sea.[51]

There are a few instances in which Callimachus integrates yet modifies Pindar's poetry even less conspicuously into his own. One is a point at which Callimachus sets the dramatic stage for an outburst of Hera's anger. Iris reports that after much arduous wandering Leto has been given refuge by Asteria (*Hymn* 4.216-239). As discussed earlier, Callimachus has altered Iris' role from that of 'helper' in the *Homeric Hymn*,[52] and he continues to present the unexpected. After a long, dramatic build-up (most of the *narratio* up to these verses) we expect Hera to explode into anger after Iris' report, especially if we recall the Hera of the *Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo*. But no such thing happens.[53] Instead, in another example of a reflective allusion, Callimachus' Hera rationalizes her non-anger by recalling Pindar's poetry and, in this case, verifying the validity of a myth found there.[54] In *Paean* 7b.42-51 Pindar reports that the daughter of Coeus, not Leto, but most definitely the

[50] We know that Callimachus would have taken an interest in such details; e.g. his work *κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων καὶ μετονομασίαι*. See also Pfeiffer's comments on Fr. 601.

[51] Bing (1988), 102.

[52] See above pp. 123-124.

[53] Haslam (1993), 111-125 has pointed out that this is a typical technique of the poet.

[54] Depew (1998), 171 has recognized the connection between the two texts.

nymph/island, since she is later referred to as Ortygia (7b.48), was unwilling to do something. Following Snell's emendation, Rutherford conjectures that the lost words were something to the effect of *ἐθέλο[ισ' ἐμβῆναι λέχος / π[όντονδ' ἔφυγεν* (*Paean* 7b.43-44). This would seem to tally with the use of the genitive *Διὸς* and the rather certain verses 46-8: *δέ μιν ἐν πέλ[α]γ[ο]ς / ῥιφθεῖσαν εὐαγέα πέτραν φανῆναι / καλέοντι μιν Ὀρτυγίαν ναῦται πάλαι.* ("But they say that she was flung into the sea and appeared as a conspicuous rock. Sailors have long called it Ortygia."). As Rutherford points out, even the narrator of the poem doubts whether or not to lend credence to the story that Asteria was thrown into the sea, and seems to decide that this myth is unbelievable (7b.42 and 45 respectively). With these words it seems that Pindar wished not to reject the myth, but to "indicate embarrassment at the incredible nature of the myth without full rejection of it."[55] The reader may recall these verses of Pindar when, in Callimachus' *Hymn* 4, after Iris has reported Asteria's acceptance of Leto, he reads that Hera very unexpectedly relents in her anger; the goddess declares that she is not angry with Asteria, even though she very wrongly did Leto a favor (*Hymn* 4.244-246). Rather the queen of the gods honors the island exceedingly because she preferred the sea to Zeus (verses 247-248): *ἀλλά μιν ἔκπαγλόν τι σεβίζομαι, οὕνεκ' ἐμεῖο / δέμνιον οὐκ ἐπάτησε, Διὸς δ' ἀνθείλετο πόντον.* ("but I honor her exceedingly because she did not trample on my marriage bed, but instead of Zeus preferred the sea"). Hera may be angry with Leto for not eluding Zeus, but once Callimachus invites the reader to remember Pindar's verses he must smile at the notion that Hera herself verifies the incredible myth of Asteria's rebirth as an island. Hera herself speaks as if she has read Pindar as well.

Given that Hesiod knew of Asteria's and Leto's kinship (*Theog.* 404-410), it would be remarkable if Callimachus made nothing of it, as he apparently does not in this hymn.[56] But once again Callimachus counts on his reader's knowledge of his predecessors to completely understand the relationship of these two. We remember that the *Homeric Hymn* makes no mention of the fact that they are sisters. In fact,

---

[55] Rutherford (2001), 250-251. As Rutherford points out, Pindar is not beyond the outright rejection of a myth, cf. *Ol.* 1.51ff.; the poet also mentions the incredible nature of a myth without completely rejecting it, cf. *Ol.* 9.35ff.

[56] So says Mineur (1984), 83-84 who believes that Callimachus' extensive characterization of Asteria/Delos by Apollo verses 191-195 "suggests that Leto was unfamiliar with the island".

Leto must bribe the island to accept her. In Pindar's *Paean* 7b.43ff the poet tells of how a daughter of Coeus, Asteria, became a rock after eluding the king of the gods. In the *Hymn to Delos*, the Hellenistic poet describes Leto with the patronymic Κοιηίς (*Hymn* 4.150), a Callimachean *hapax*, and in doing so alludes reflectively to Pindar once more. This reference is not overt, but given the mass of allusions Callimachus has constructed to Pindar's poetry within this nexus of stories, it is likely that he would expect his reader to recognize this as another reference to Pindar and to recognize the relationship of the nymph/island and Leto.[57] If the reader understands this allusion, then Callimachus' narrative does indeed subtly exploit their sisterhood.[58] Once we recall the Pindaric text, we no longer fear the island's rejection of Leto.[59]

Moving beyond specific allusions toward the overall treatment of the tales, we see that both poets share a shift in focus away from the primary subject matter of their predecessor. Pindar's account of the god's birth stands in sharp relief to that of the *Homeric Hymn* in that the lyric poet consistently relates a tale that emphasizes the pre-Apolline nymph/island. Neither Callimachus' nor Pindar's texts reflect a primary interest in the god's birth. Callimachus is most interested in the relationship between the island and the divinity and the opportunities for praise this relationship offered him poetically. Ultimately, Callimachus, like Pindar, is more interested in the island; his secondary interest is Apollo.[60]

Conclusion I

One scholar has offered an explanation for Callimachus' main objective concerning allusions to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and Pindar.

[57] Though some scholars reject this idea, e.g. Bing (1988), 107; Mineur (1984), (see note above); Haslam (1993), 120 (who asserts that Callimachus' re-scripting here is a case of *oppositio in imitando*) and Depew (1998), 169 believe that though this allusion is not overt, it is clearly present.

[58] Depew (1998), 170-171.

[59] Bing's opinion that Callimachus dropped that "Hesiodic/Pindaric idea that Leto and Asteria were sisters" in order to point up the island's non-prejudice and free will when choosing to allow Apollo's birth, seems to be more elaborate than necessary (1988), 108-143. Surely Callimachus expects the well-versed reader to recognize the kinship and the allusion.

[60] Depew (1998), 161-171.

According to Bing, Asteria's flight from Zeus represents purity that is compatible with that of Apollo. Callimachus adopts Pindaric themes to emphasize the nymph/island's purity, but does not ally himself totally with that poetry.[61] According to Bing Callimachus signals this partial refusal in his rejection of the notion that Asteria and Leto are sisters. This rejection, or omission, heightens Asteria's free will and daring, and serves not only to exalt the island further, but Apollo as well, indirectly. Furthermore, Bing asserts that Callimachus also adopts Pindar's agonistic attitude towards the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. In his view Callimachus' depiction of the birth of Delos represents the realization of Callimachean song; Callimachus aligns Delos, Apollo, Philadelphus, purity, peace, and Callimachean aesthetics on one side and on the other Ares, barbarian invasions, and Homeric style and themes. Callimachus assumes Pindar's attitude toward their predecessor along with the Pindaric motif of Asteria's purity, which he then makes central to his own hymn.[62] This explanation of the allusions that Callimachus makes to Pindar would help Rutherford's examination of Pindar's four accounts of the birth of Apollo, all strikingly different from the *Homeric Hymn*.[63] However, it hardly seems like Callimachus to align himself so closely with any other poet.[64] Furthermore, Callimachus' attitude toward the *Homeric Hymn* is not entirely unambiguous.[65]

We have seen that in his *Hymn to Delos* Callimachus alludes integratively to the genre "hymn" by incorporating some generic signatures of the hymnic form into his own poem. This allusive technique validates Callimachus' poem as a hymn and as a text belonging to the hymnic tradition. Callimachus also alludes reflectively, both lexically and non-lexically, to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* in particular. These reflective allusions, which refer the reader to the "charter myth" of Apollo[66] and which signal Callimachus' alterations to this particular story, are marked by a technique observed first in Homer; alterations to a traditional story are placed within the mouths of credible, trustworthy characters. In this way a deviation from the original story is authorized.

---

[61] Bing (1988), 106-107.
[62] Bing (1988), 121.
[63] Rutherford (1988), 68.
[64] Depew (1998), 174.
[65] See pp. 116-126, as well as Haslam (1993), 119, who also believes that the relationship between Callimachus' hymn and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is not polemical, though two scholars disagree: Bornmann (1968), xvi, n.4; and Reinsch-Werner (1976).
[66] Furley and Bremer (2001),102.

Ultimately this authorization technique indicates the presence of reflective allusions.

One effect of these integrative and reflective allusions is that Callimachus' hymn seems to be simultaneously asserting a right to be categorized as a hymn and contrasting itself with the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. This apparent dissonance becomes harmony when we remember that the primary subject of Callimachus' hymn is not Apollo, and that the reflective allusions prepare the reader for Callimachus' shift in focus from the divinity to the place of the divinity's birth. The poet seems to be saying that the *laudanda* of his hymn may be unusual, but that the poem is indeed a hymn.

Callimachus accomplishes the shift in focus in his hymn primarily by concentrating upon Asteria/Delos, the characterization of which at first glance appears to have been borrowed from Pindar's poetry. In fact, Callimachus does adopt several themes that recur in Pindar's portrayal of the nymph/island. The careful reader, however, detects Callimachus' subtle changes and the fact that these are reflective allusions; the Asteria of Callimachus contrasts with that of Pindar.

The adoption of generic signatures, which may be viewed as integrative allusions to the hymnic genre, coupled with the simultaneous reflective allusions to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* suggest that the poet used the hymnic form for subject matter beyond the most usual or anticipated for this genre. On the other hand, though his hymn possesses no generic signatures of the paean, Callimachus' subtle reflective allusions to Pindar's Asteria, a character which appears primarily in the poet's paeans, as well as the poet's inclusion of a paean to Ptolemy within this hymn (*Hymn* 4.160-190), imply that the categorization of Callimachus' hymn might be more ambiguous.

An Overview of Ovid's Asterie, Delos, Niobe, and Latona

The characters of Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 make an appearance in a series of somewhat tenuously connected stories running from verses 108-318 of *Metamorphoses* Book 6.[67] Asterie (or Asteria, as Callimachus refers to her), the character that is pivotal to Callimachus' shift of focus in his hymn, appears only very briefly (*Met.* 6.108) within the story of the

[67] For an overview of the contents of this book of the *Metamorphoses* see Albrecht (2003), 139-140.

weaving contest between Arachne and Pallas (*Met.* 6.1-145).[68] Ovid has quite literally woven her into the tapestry that Arachne creates (*Met.* 6.103-128); she is described as the second in a long list of the mortal women pursued by the principal male gods.

Latona and her immortal children, Apollo and Artemis, appear in the two subsequent stories.[69] The first, connected to that of Arachne and Athena via the theme of "arrogant mortal punished by a divinity," details the arrogance and downfall of the queen Niobe (*Met.* 6.146-312). The queen of Thebes tries to prohibit the worship of Latona on the grounds that her ancestry is superior, her status and its accoutrements are more noble, and that she has produced a greater number of children (*Met.* 6.146-203). Latona then travels to Mt. Cynthus where she bitterly complains of Niobe's arrogance towards her children, who promise to punish the queen (*Met.* 6.204-217). In the many succeeding verses Ovid describes the deaths of Niobe's children as well as that of her husband (*Met.* 6.218-302), and, finally, the crowning punishment, Niobe's transformation into a perpetually weeping rock (*Met.* 6.303-312).

Latona then takes center stage in the subsequent narrative (*Met.* 6.313-381). To correct the impression of Latona as an angry avenging goddess, to vary the theme of *ira numinis,* and to continue the theme of the arrogance of humans in the face of a divinity, Latona is now portrayed as a victim.[70] Ovid first briefly describes the pregnant Latona's wanderings before obtaining shelter on Delos, where she gave birth to Artemis and Apollo (*Met.* 6.331-338). However, in this version even after the birth Latona is hounded by Hera, and in her wandering encounters a lake in Lycia where she would like to quench her thirst. The mortals working around the lake prevent her from doing so, even after kind requests become pleading. Being provoked to anger, only then

---

[68] The story of Perimele in Book 8 shares many parallels to the story of Asteria. Perimele's father, Hippodamas, angry because of her affair with Achelous, casts her from a rock into a river. She washes into the sea and Neptune answers Achelous' request by transforming her into an island that becomes a favorite of the river. See Crabbe (1981), 2289, concerning these parallel stories as well as her observation that the Echinades, which Achelous punishes before this story of Perimele's transformation, Callimachus also portrays negatively in his *Hymn to Delos* verse 155; here Echinades is one of the first islands to flee when Leto approaches.

[69] It should also be noted that Ovid himself refers to the fact that Latona gave birth to Apollo and Artemis on Delos at 8.635. This occurs within the story of Aeneas when he lands on Delos after his flight from Troy.

[70] Anderson (1972), 194ff.

does Latona turn the arrogant Lycian *coloni* into frogs (*Met.* 6.339-381).

Other Occurrences of Asterie, Niobe, and Latona and the Lycian Colonists

The story of Asterie is not well known today. In Hesiod's *Theogony* (verses 404-412) she is the daughter of Coeus and Phoebe, Leto's sister, the wife of Perses, and Hecate's mother. Musaeus records that Zeus, not Perses, is Hecate's father; after Hecate's birth Zeus gives Asteria to Perses.[71] As we have seen, Pindar records a rather more tempestuous relationship with the king of the gods. Zeus pursues her, presumably for amatory reasons; she is unwilling and is cast into the sea as a rock that becomes the island Ortygia (*Paean* 7b.43-52). In another paean Pindar identifies the island of Delos as formerly Asteria (*Paean* 5). Prior to Ovid, Callimachus is the only other author to repeat this story, and after Ovid only Apollodorus and Hyginus relate it fully.[72] In extant Latin literature prior to Ovid there is no mention of Asterie, though judging by the brevity of Ovid's allusion to her story, and by his reference to Leda in the following verse (*Met.* 6.109), it seems that in Ovid's day the tale of Asterie was well known.

If the number of extant fragments as well as complete versions of Niobe's tale are sufficient evidence to judge, it would seem that this mythological queen, on the other hand, was a favorite subject of ancient poets.[73] As discussed rather extensively above, the Niobe-myth appears first in extant literature in the *Il.* 24.602-617; Achilles uses, and apparently improvises the details of her tale to illustrate to Priam the need to put aside grief and to eat. We have no evidence for the rest of the archaic period other than what relatively late sources, i.e. Aelian, Aulus Gellius, and a scholium on the *Phoenissae*, tell us about the number of children the queen lost.[74] The scholiast of Euripides' *Phoenissae* verse 159 tells us that Aeschylus and Sophocles wrote

[71] See Musaeus, *Schol. Ap. Rh.* 3. 467.

[72] Apollodorus 1.4.1; Hyginus Fr. 53; see also Euripides *Hec.* 454; Antoninus Liberalis 35; *Schol. A.R.* 1.308 and 1.419; *Eust. Hom.* 1528.4; and *Tzetz. Lycophron* 401.

[73] For a complete list of all authors who mention Niobe see Roscher (1884-1937), 372 and Gantz (1993), 536-540.

[74] Mostly the number is divided equally between males and females. In Homer there are six males and females; in Hesiod nine and ten, or ten each (Hes. Fr. 183 MW); Alkman ten in all (75 *PMG*); Mimnermus twenty (19 W); Sappho nine males and nine females; Lasus seven and seven (705 *PMG*); in Pindar (Fr. 52n) and Bacchylides (Fr.

nissae verse 159 tells us that Aeschylus and Sophocles wrote tragedies based on the Niobe myth, but that Euripides did not.[75] Niobe's story is mentioned very briefly in two tragedies by Sophocles. In his *Antigone* (822-832) the young girl recalls the Theban queen (i.e. Niobe), Tantalus's daughter, and the fact that the queen still "lives" in the form of a rock. Niobe makes another momentary appearance in Sophocles' *Electra* (150-152) when the young Electra says that she counts Niobe, who suffered all, a fellow-mourner.

Considering how closely Niobe figures in myths surrounding Apollo and Artemis, as well as Latona, it is not surprising that Callimachus makes reference to her myth in two of his hymns. As we have seen, Niobe appears briefly in Callimachus *Hymn* 4.96-97 and in his *Hymn* 2.22-24, where the poet only mentions the woman's final fate. A more lengthy Niobe tale is extant in Parthenius's Ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα, skeleton love stories gathered from Greek poets, antiquarians, and historians. In his thirty-third story he records that Niobe's story is told differently by various authorities. His own Niobe was the daughter of Assaon and was married to Philottus. Her dispute with Leto centered on the beauty of her children, which was greater than that of Apollo and Artemis; for this reason she was punished by Leto. Niobe's punishment was that her husband was killed while hunting and her father was then provoked to desire her. After Niobe rejected her father's advances, he killed all of her children at a banquet, and in despair Niobe flung herself from a high rock. Ashamed of his actions, her father Assaon soon followed.

After Ovid, the prose mythographer Apollodorus, in 3.5.6 of his *Bibliotheca*, records a complete account of Niobe. In this version Niobe, the daughter of Tantalus, marries Amphion and bore him seven sons and seven daughters.[76] When Niobe boasts that she was more blessed with children than Leto, Leto incites Apollo and Artemis to

---

20D) ten and ten; in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides seven and seven (schol. *Phoen.*); and in Pherecydes six and six (3F56). For the most detailed accounting of the number of Niobe's children reported by various authors see also Roscher (1916-1924), 372.

[75] The number Euripides' quotes comes from his *Cresphontes* (Fr. 455).

[76] Apollodorus reports Niobe's children's names as follows: Sipylus, Eupinytus, Ismenus, Damasichthon, Agenor, Phaedimus, Tantulus, Ethodaia (or as some say Neaera), Cleodoxa, Astyoche, Phthia, Pelopia, Astycratis, and Ogygia. Ovid gives the daughters no names, but lists the sons as Ismenus, Siplyus, Phaedimus, Tantalus, Alphenor, Delius, and Damasichthon, which parallel five of Apollodorus's names.

slay her children. After the death of her children,[77] Niobe departs from Thebes, goes to her father Tantalus at Sipylus and while praying to Zeus she is turned into a stone, which even now sheds tears day and night.

When trying to determine to whom Ovid may allude in his own version, all extant information concerning Niobe's tale is both a blessing and a curse. It is clear that Ovid had abundant sources from which to draw, but because of the fragmentary nature of many of the tales, it will be impossible to trace all allusions precisely. A cursory comparison of all the versions of and references to Niobe's myth reveals that the primary difference between them is the number of children she is said to have borne. Ovid has the queen losing fourteen children, seven male and seven female, which agrees with the scholiast of Euripides' *Phoenissae*, who reports that all three of the great Athenian tragedians gave Niobe fourteen children. Of all extant sources only the post-Ovidian Apollodorus and Ovid give the children names, though their lists do not agree completely.[78] The innovations Ovid made to the myth of Niobe will be discussed in much greater detail later in this chapter. For the moment we may state that while the Latin poet appears to remain close to the extant tradition, his main innovations seem to be the queen's claim that she is more godlike,[79] the extensive characterization of the queen through her speech to the Thebans, and the vivid description of the slaughter of her children.

Finally, the story of Latona and the Lycian *coloni*, recorded by Ovid in verses 313-381 of Book 6, is not a common one.[80] In fact, the first extant version of this tale, which is preserved for us in Antoninus Liberalis 35, is recorded by Nicander.[81] In this version, Leto leaves the island Delos with her divine children not because Hera pursues her, as Ovid relates, but because she wishes to bathe them in the river Xanthus in Lycia. Upon arriving in Lycia, she happens upon a spring, called Melite, in which she decides to bathe her children before proceeding to

---

[77] Apollodorus writes that some authors record the survival of some of Niobe's children, 3.5.6.

[78] See p. 139, footnote 76.

[79] As Anderson (1972), 171-172, has pointed out.

[80] The article of Clauss (1989), 297-314 explores the programmatic significance of this story.

[81] Nicander is thought to have lived during the second century B.C., while Antoninus Liberalis 35 records that the tale of Leto and the Lycian cowherds he tells is based on that of Menecrates of Xanthus (a fourth-century writer of the history of Lycia, *Λυκιακά*, in Ionic) and Nicander's *Heteroioumena*.

the river. Cowherds drive her away from this spring because they wish to water their herd there. Latona leaves the spring and encounters wolves, which guide her to the Xanthus.[82] At the river she drinks, bathes her children, but returns to the Melite, where she transforms the cowherds into frogs. A closer comparison of versions follows below, but here we may note that in Ovid's tale the goddess does not leave the island of her own free will, nor does she seek to bathe her children, but only to drink.

Ovidian Allusion in Met. *6.108-383: Asterie, Niobe, and Latona*

In comparison to Callimachus' series of rather systematic allusions to either the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* or Pindar's poetry, the allusions found in the first half of *Metamorphoses* 6 may strike the reader as less discriminate. In these verses Ovid often alludes first reflectively, then integratively, both lexically and thematically, to one source, then another, seemingly picking and choosing from various authors whose versions and details best suited his poetic needs. All of Ovid's allusions can ultimately be traced to the over-arching themes of *certamen* and *ira numinis* begun in Book 5. Because there are relatively few extant versions of the tales analyzed here, in some respects this portion of the study of Ovidian allusion must be more representative than definitive.

For instance, an examination of Ovid's brief mention of Asterie in the story of Arachne and Minerva (the brevity of which suggests that the tale was well known) reveals three alterations to the other surviving versions, all of which point to Ovid's thematic reflective allusion to Pindar's and Callimachus' poetry. The poet writes *fecit et Asterien aquila luctante teneri* (*Met.* 6.108). Though Jupiter's name is not mentioned explicitly until verse 111, the first five verses of Ovid's description of Arachne's tapestry (*Met.* 6.103-107) effectively introduce the king of the gods, seducer of mortal women, as one of the subjects of the tapestry (*Met.* 6.103-114). By emphasizing Jupiter's transformation, not Asterie's, though, the nymph's metamorphosis plays a central

[82] The primary point of Nicander's account (as recorded in Antoninus Liberalis) seems to be aetiological. He records that Leto names the region after the wolves that have aided her, she assigned the river Xanthus to Apollo, and finally she 'created' frogs from the cowherds who denied her access to the spring.

role in both Pindar's and Callimachus' poetry, [83] the poet nods to his predecessors' treatment of her while altering the traditional tale. Considering that the theme of the tapestry is the victimization of females by false gods, most often disguised,[84] this shift works best for the poet's purposes. In all extant texts only Callimachus, in his *Hymn to Delos* (247-248), and Pindar, in his *Paean* 7b.42-51, and the post-Ovidian Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* 1.4.1), refer to Zeus' pursuit of Asterie, and no extant texts other than Ovid's record Zeus's transformation into an eagle. Consistent with the poet's focus on the god's metamorphosis, he does not connect the nymph to her later incarnation, the island Delos, or to her sister Latona. The most likely explanation for this is that these details would not have suited the theme of Arachne's tapestry. The inclusion of Asterie may well be an allusion to Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*. As we have seen, in this hymn the poet connects the stories of Asteria, Niobe, and Leto, three characters which are bound together in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Book 6 in three consecutive stories.

Ovid's portrayal of Niobe reveals a more complex allusive technique that reflects the various ways and purposes for which his Greek and Roman predecessors used this tale. One extant image of Niobe that is preserved for us, and to which Ovid alludes reflectively is one with a seemingly long tradition running at least from Greek tragedy to Augustan poetry; i.e. the woman of eternal grief.[85] The earliest examples of this type of brief allusion, that at some point probably became a poetic commonplace, occur in two of Sophocles' tragedies. In the *Antigone* (822-32), as the protagonist prepares to enter the cave where she will meet her end, she announces her impending suicide. The chorus consoles her, saying that though she will die, she will die as she chooses, not by sickness or at another's hands. Antigone responds by saying that she has heard about the saddest of all deaths, the death of the *τὰν Φρυγίαν ξέναν / Ταντάλου*, i.e. Niobe (824-5). She is a rock, exposed

[83] Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* 1.4.1) reports that while being pursued by an amorous Zeus, Asteria turned herself into a quail before becoming an island. In Hyginus (*Fab.* 53) Zeus transforms Asteria into a quail.

[84] The repetition of *verum...vera* (verse 104) and *falsa* (verse 125) reinforces this notion. See Anderson (1972), 175.

[85] As de Jong (2003), 188-210 states, the Niobe exempla of the *Iliad* 24.599-620; *Antigone* 823-833; and *Electra* 145-152 are in all cases altered to suit their respective contexts, but these three passages agree in two respects: deep sorrow following the death of relatives and the story of Niobe is used in as a rhetorical device within rhetorical situations.

to the elements and her tears wet the crags (823-833), she too, she says, is like Niobe: *ᾇ με δαί- / μων ὁμοιοτάταν κατευνάζει* (832-833).

Sophocles uses the image of Niobe's final fate in describing another of his young heroines, Electra, in his tragedy of the same name. Early in this drama Electra informs the chorus of the importance of remembering one's deceased parents. Electra's grief presumably fuels her desire for vengeance; this is reflected when the protagonist says that the bird that cries "Itys, Itys" is more suited to her heart, and that she considers Niobe, the one who endured so much and who now weeps perpetually, a god (145-152).

A brief allusion to Niobe's fate also occurs much later in Propertius' elegies. In a poem addressed to his beloved, he compares her sorrow to that of mythological heroines. The poet alludes to Niobe as an eternally weeping rock; this reference concludes the list, thus suggesting that her grief surpasses that of the others mentioned (2.20.1-8):[86]

> Quid fles abducta gravius Briseide? quid fles
> anxia captiva tristius Andromacha?
> quidve mea de fraude deos, insana, fatigas?
> quid quereris nostram sic cecidisse fidem?
> non tam nocturna volucris funesta querela
> Attica Cecropiis obstrepit in foliis,
> nec tantum Niobe bis sex ad busta superba
> sollicito lacrimas defluit a Sipylo.
>
> Why do you weep more bitterly than Briseis?
> Why do you anxiously weep more sadly than
> captive Andromache?
> Or why, mad girl, do you weary the ears of the gods
> with complaint of my perfidy? Why do you
> moan that my loyalty to you has sunk so low?
> Not so shrilly does the nocturnal mourning bird
> of Attica make her moan embowered in Cecropian
> leafage, not so does proud Niobe by twice six tombs
> stream tears down sorrowing Sipylus.

These three passages, which span approximately four hundred years, indicate that one manner in which the character of Niobe endured was as a topos of great sorrow. Of course, in one sense Ovid integrated this image into his poem (*Met.* 6. 301-312), thus we might conclude that he alludes integratively to the general tradition here represented by

[86] Note that Propertius follows the Homeric precedent of 12 children, in comparison to Ovid's 14.

Sophocles and Propertius. The main thrust of Ovid's story, however, is quite different from that of these two poets. A brief mention of Niobe's fate suffices for Sophocles' and Propertius' purposes, which are simply to call to mind an image of eternal grief. Since their primary concern is to convey one emotion of what she came to represent, the poets omitted the circumstances that led to the queen's sorrow. In Ovid's rendition of Niobe's fate there is a shift in focus towards what Sophocles and Propertius have omitted: the cause of the gods' anger. The purpose of his version of Niobe's tale is to continue the themes of *certamen* and *ira numinis* introduced in the story of the contest between the Muses and the Pierides and concluded in the musical battle between Marsyas and Apollo. It is usual poetic practice to re-use and revise a story as seemingly as old as Niobe's, but in his shift of focus and purpose there is an integrative allusion to Callimachus' poetry.

When we turn to Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* we find a fleeting reference to a Niobe more in line with the Ovidian one. As the pregnant Leto wanders in search of a birthing place for her offspring, she pauses at Thebes, and it is here where the still unborn Apollo utters one of two prophecies of the hymn (*Hymn* 4.88-98). In these verses Niobe's crime and punishment are linked. Callimachus explicitly and syntactically connects her slander to her children (*σὺ* [Thebes] *δὲ τέκνα κακογλώσσοιο γυναικὸς / ἔλλαχες*) and makes it clear that the god will seek retribution for this slander (*Hymn* 4.96-97). In his *Hymn to Apollo* Callimachus refers to Niobe's final form to underline the power of the god (*Hymn* 2.22-25):

> *καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος,*
> *ὅστις ἐνὶ Φρυγίῃ διερὸς λίθος ἐστήρικται,*
> *μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς ὀϊζυρόν τι χανούσης*
> *ἰὴ ἰὴ φθέγγεσθε· κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν.*
>
> The tearful rock defers its pain, the wet stone that
> is set in Phrygia, a marble rock like a woman open-
> mouthed in some sorrowful utterance. Say Hie! Hie!
> It is a bad thing to strive with the blessed ones.

The poet once more closely associates Niobe's final form of a perpetually weeping rock to her crime, i.e. contending with a divinity. It is this point, emphasized on two occasions in Callimachus' poetry, that Ovid integrates into his own version of the Niobe myth. In fact, one could say that Ovid's integrative reference to Callimachus' Niobe, the one

that contends with a divinity, is at the heart of his own narrative, which hangs on the themes of *certamen* and *ira numinis*.

The other main extant tradition of Niobe is preserved by two authors in addition to Ovid.[87] The earliest of these appears in Homer's *Iliad* (*Il.* 24.599-617), treated earlier in this chapter. Here Homer employs an altered version of Niobe's story as a *paradeigma* for Achilles to use to urge Priam to eat. It seems clear that Homer altered the details of this story, namely the addition of the queen eating and Zeus turning the Thebans to stone, so that the story might more closely parallel Priam's situation. When we compare the Homeric and Ovidian texts, one rather brief reflective allusion emerges. Homer describes Niobe with the formulaic *ἠΰκομος* Νιόβη (*Il.* 24.602). Ovid alludes to this description reflectively by expanding upon the Homeric epithet (*Met.* 6.165-69):

ecce venit comitum Niobe celeberrima turba,
vestibus intexto Phrygiis spectabilis auro
et, quantum ira sinit, formosa movensque decoro
cum capite inmissos umerum per utrumque capillos
constitit;

Then Niobe appeared well attended by a throng of attendants.
She was a handsome sight, in her Phrygian robes of gold tissue.
She halted tossing her lovely head and with hair
that streamed loose upon her shoulders,
and she was as beautiful as her anger allowed.

Not only does Ovid's Niobe possess "fair" hair, it is long, the queen is dressed in splendid robes, and she is *formosa*. This expansion of the physical description of Niobe serves the purpose of building pathos; the queen's wealth, power, and beauty only make her fall more dramatic and contrast all the more with her final fate.

Ovid has embellished this account in a few other notable ways. He has increased the Homeric number of children from twelve to fourteen

[87] It would be enlightening to have the complete Niobe tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles, which may have focused on the culpability of the queen and, if extant in Ovid's time, probably would have influenced Ovid's portrayal. For fragments see Radt *TGrF*; vol. 4, p. 25.441a-451. Sophocles' tragedy in particular might have influenced Ovid's tale considerably. Papyrus fragments of Sophocles' play make it plain that Apollo and Artemis appeared on stage to hunt Niobe's daughters; the sons seem to have been killed offstage, though Plutarch (*Mor.* 760d) tells us that, when shot, one son calls out to his lover, and Athenaeus (13.601a) reports that the homosexual lovers of the sons were treated in the play, which may have increased the pathos of their deaths. see Gantz (1993), 538.

and has expanded greatly upon their simple Homeric death.[88] In his account the boys are slain while engaging in sport near the city walls (*Met.* 6.218-220), the father of the children commits suicide in the palace (*Met.* 6.271-272), and the girls are killed while tending their brothers's biers (*Met.* 6.288-301). It is unclear where the Homeric episode took place, but the Ovidian account takes place at Thebes, and once Niobe is transformed into a rock, she is transported by a whirlwind to Mt. Sipylus, her Homeric resting place.

Ovid's primary innovation and the reflective allusion lies not in Niobe's claim to be superior to Leto by virtue of having more children, which is seen in Homer, but in her claim to be more godlike.[89] Homer states simply that Niobe's children were killed by Apollo and Artemis as punishment for the queen's comparison of herself to Leto physically, and for her proclamation of superiority by virtue of her number of children (*Il.* 24.607-608). Ovid innovates with the addition of the queen's belief that she is more godlike: "*quis furor, auditos" inquit "praeponere visis / caelestes? aut cur colitur Latona per aras, / numen adhuc sine ture meum est?"* ("She said, 'What madness is this to prefer divnities you have heard about to those you can see? Why do you worship Latona before her altars, while my divinity is thus far without incense?'" *Met.* 6.170-2). In great rhetorical style Niobe continues, listing her divine lineage, her status in Thebes, as well as her wealth, finally adding the greater number of her offspring. Herein lies the main purpose of Ovid's account of Niobe; by amplifying the queen's crime, Ovid continues the theme of blasphemous mortal and the resulting *ira numinis* that began in Book 5 with the story of the contest between the Pierides and the Muses. This amplification urges the reader to set the Homeric text next to the Ovidian one and reveals the reflective allusion.

The only other extant source for the whole of the Niobe-tale is Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* 3.5.6).[90] The essentials of the texts converge at four points, but a comparison reveals that, because of key modifications in the queen's crime, the number of children killed, and how Niobe returns to her homeland, Ovid alludes reflectively to the traditional Niobe-story that is represented by Apollodorus's account. These

[88] Though the number of children in the Greek tragedies about Niobe is also fourteen.

[89] Anderson (1972), 171-172.

[90] Parthenius's Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων 33 is the only other more or less complete extant text pre-dating Ovid. See p. 139.

reflective allusions urge the reader to note more Ovidian embellishments to the tale. For example, Ovid's Niobe is punished because of her lack of respect for Latona. Part of this disrespect lies in Niobe's belief that she is superior to Latona because she has produced more children (*Met.* 6.182-183), and in the mythographer's account this is Niobe's primary crime: *εὔτεκνος δὲ οὖσα Νίοβη τῆς Λητοῦς εὐτεκνοτέρα εἶπεν ὑπάρχειν· Λητὼ δὲ ἀγανακτήσασα τήν τε Ἄρτεμιν καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα κατ' αὐτῶν παρώξυνε, καὶ τὰς μὲν θηλείας ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας κατετόξευσεν Ἄρτεμις, τοὺς δὲ ἄρρενας κοινῇ πάντας ἐν Κιθαιρῶνι Ἀπόλλων κυνηγετοῦντας ἀπέκτεινεν* ("Being blessed with children, Niobe said that she was more blessed with children than Latona. Stung by the taunt, Latona incited Artemis and Apollo against them, and Artemis shot down the females in the house, and Apollo killed all the males together as they were hunting on Cithaeron.";[91] *Bibliotheca.* 3.5.6).

That Apollodorus records the death of Niobe's seven sons as on Mt. Cithaeron, near Thebes, suggests that Ovid may have been familiar with this particular tradition, though Callimachus too placed Niobe in Thebes in his *Hymn* 4 (verses 88-98). In the Ovidian account all fourteen children are slain rather dramatically by Apollo and Artemis to heighten the pathos of the story. In Apollodorus, however, all children are slain by Apollo and Artemis, except one male, Amphion, and one female child, Chloris, both of whom are miraculously saved, *ἐσώθη δὲ τῶν μὲν ἀρρένων Ἀμφίων, τῶν δὲ θηλειῶν Χλωρὶς ἡ πρεσβυτέρα, ᾗ Νηλεὺς συνῴκησε.* ("of the males Amphion alone was saved, and of the females Chloris the elder, whom Neleus married"; *Bibliotheca* 3.5.6).[92] Finally, both Apollodorus' and Ovid's versions agree that Niobe returns to her native land and becomes a weeping stone. Apollodorus' Niobe does this in a more prosaic fashion, simply leaving Thebes and returning to her father, Tantalus, at Mt. Sipylus, where, while praying to Zeus, she is transformed into a stone *αὐτὴ δὲ Νιόβη Θήβας ἀπολιποῦσα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Τάνταλον ἧκεν εἰς Σίπυλον, κἀκεῖ Διὶ εὐξαμένη τὴν μορφὴν εἰς λίθον μετέβαλε, καὶ χεῖται δάκρυα νύκτωρ καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν τοῦ λίθου.* ("But Niobe herself quitted Thebes and went to her father Tantalus at Sipylus, and there, on praying to Zeus, she was transformed into a stone, and tears flow night and day from the

[91] Translation is that of Frazer (1956 and 1961), 343.

[92] Apollodorus records that Telesilla writes that the two children spared were Amyklas and the female Meliboia (*Bibliotheca* 3.5.6).

stone"; *Bibliotheca* 3.5.6). Ovid's Niobe returns rather spectacularly: she is transported to Mt. Sipylus via a whirlwind.

This series of reflective allusions, both to the commonplaces used by Sophocles and Propertius and to the details recorded in longer versions of Niobe's tale, as well as Ovid's integrative allusions to Callimachus, urges the reader to refer back to other texts and catch the allusions. The poet's primary innovation to the traditional Niobe story, i.e., that the queen is more god-like than Latona, is placed within Niobe's mouth. Thus Niobe's speech succinctly characterizes her, justifies her punishment, and authorizes Ovid's alteration of the myth. Who can question the validity of a story if the central figure of the story alters it? But here in Ovid's text this authorization technique turns back upon itself. Niobe is portrayed as so blasphemous that the reader may question her account of events, and therefore question Ovid's narrative, which in turn sends the reader once more to the Niobe tales of others.

A more careful examination of Ovid's stories reveals still another layer of rather subtle allusions. The first such allusion occurs near the beginning of his Niobe narrative. In her speech, Niobe justifies the cessation of Leto's worship by boasting first of her own fine lineage (she is the daughter of the famous Tantalus and a sister of the Pleiades, the granddaughter of Atlas and Jupiter), of the fact that she and her husband's power as king and queen, of her material wealth, and of her fourteen children. She compares all of this to Leto's lineage: *quaerite nunc, habeat quam nostra superbia causam, / nescio quoque audete satam Titanida Coeo / Latonam praeferre mihi...* ("now you ask what cause I have for pride? Dare you to prefer Leto, the daughter of the Titan Coeus, whoever he is, to me?"; *Met.* 6.184-186). Though the reader must suspect Niobe's tragic end, he must laugh nevertheless. Who, indeed, is Coeus? Though a Titan, in comparison to the (in)famous Tantalus, a sister of the Pleiades, Atlas and Jupiter, Coeus's reputation pales. Niobe's *nescio quo* playfully suggests that she knows little about divine genealogy, of which the casual reader may be equally ignorant. The careful reader will catch the integrative allusion when he remembers that Hesiod records (*Theog.* 404-410) Coeus as the father of both Leto and Asteria, and that two sources connect Coeus to Latona (Leto), but not to her sister Asterie (Asteria/Delos): the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (62) and Callimachus *Hymn to Delos* (*Hymn* 4.150). We have seen that the *Homeric Hymn* in no way suggests a relationship between Leto and Asteria, while Callimachus' use of this

patronymic suggests his awareness of her relationship to Asteria (and is perhaps a reference to Pindar).[93] Ovid's allusion to the patronymic of the *Homeric Hymn* and Callimachus' hymn requires a careful and imaginative reader—just such a reader as Ovid. He casually and playfully integrates this allusion which points to Callimachus and the relationship between Latona and Asterie.

The verses that Niobe utters constitute a reflective allusion to the wanderings of Latona depicted in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and in Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*: *cui maxima quondam / exiguam sedem pariturae terra negavit! / nec caelo nec humo nec aquis dea vestra recepta est* ([Leto] to whom the very great earth once denied a scanty spot when she was about to give birth! Your goddess was received by neither the sky, nor the earth, nor the waters."; *Met.* 6.186-188). The reader may recall verses 30-50 of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, in which Leto roams in search of a birthplace for her son (verses 45-46), but fearing the power of the future god, various lands do not dare receive her (verses 47-48). It is not until Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* that the element of Hera's anger plays a primary role in the rejection of Leto by land and cities (verses 68-69; and *passim*). Callimachus, however, makes it clear that Asteria alone was unafraid of the anger of the queen of the gods (verse 55; 203-204). When we compare Ovid's description of Latona's rejection to these we see that the poet greatly compresses and generalizes the contents of these accounts, especially Callimachus', which we remember runs to hundreds of lines. For rhetorical effect Ovid omits the various fears expressed in both the Homeric and Callimachean hymns; by simply stating that Leto found no refuge, Ovid's Niobe implies that the goddess was unworthy of it.

Niobe's next words are rather curious. She seemingly quotes Delos, but whose Delos is not clear: *"hospita tu terris erras, ego" dixit "in undis,"/ instabilemque locum Delos dedit* ("'stranger, you wander the earth as I wander the sea,' she said, and Delos gave her an unstable place."*Met.* 6.190-191). Perhaps this comes directly from a source now lost to us, or perhaps this is meant to be generally reminiscent of the previous poetry that has exploited the island's and Latona's wanderings. These verses certainly do recall the theme of mobility evident in Pindar's and Callimachus' work. The reader may also remember that while Pindar makes much of the mobility of

[93] See pp. 133-134.

Delos/Asteria,[94] he writes nothing about Leto's wanderings. The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* lists the places Leto wandered in search of a birthing place (verses 30-48), but says nothing about the island itself wandering. It is not until we reach Callimachus' hymn that the wanderings of both are described as parallel until at last they intersect.[95] Ovid echoes this merging and syntactically duplicates it in one verse (*Met.* 6.191), thus compressing Callimachus' extensive recital of the island's wanderings (*Hymn* 4.11-50) and Leto's wanderings (*Hymn* 4.68-195), integrating both into his narrative.

Ovid artfully segues from Niobe's metamorphosis to a story in which Latona takes center stage. In this story the poet transforms the avenging goddess relegated to the borders of the tale into the victim with whom the reader can sympathize, while continuing the theme of blasphemous mortals punished by a divinity. As Ovid tells the reader, this story is indeed a *res obscura* (*Met.* 6.319). The only extant text that preserves it is the post-Ovidian *Μεταμορφώσεων συναγωγή* (35) of Antoninus Liberalis.[96] Antoninus tells us that his version is a summary based upon stories found in the *Lykiaka* of Menecrates of Xanthus and in the *Heteroioumena* of Nicander.[97] Ovid's use of Nicander is well documented, and it is likely that he may have used Nicander's version of this story.[98] Unfortunately, how precisely Antoninus may have recorded the details of Nicander's version cannot be established. However, it does not seem unlikely that he does preserve the outline of Nicander's Leto and the *βουκόλοι* faithfully.

Both Antoninus' and Ovid's versions share the same broad outline, both are metamorphoses stories whose purpose is aetological, but the details of each are dissimilar. Antoninus' Leto goes to Lycia to visit the river Xanthus of her own volition, while Ovid's Latona is driven to Lycia by the wrath of Hera. Once in Lycia, Antoninus' goddess happens upon a fountain, called Melite, in which she is eager to wash her children. Ovid's Latona, however, explicitly tells the *coloni* (not the *βουκόλοι* of Antoninus) that she does not wish to bathe in the lake, but simply to drink (*Met.* 6.352-354). Antoninus' Leto and Ovid's

---

[94] See Pindar's *Hymn to Zeus* 33d1-3 and *Paean* 7b49-51, pp. 129-131.

[95] See p. 114.

[96] For a comparison of this story and Ovid's see Castiglioni (1906), 353ff. and Bömer (1976), 93-94. Clauss (1989), 297-314 views this episode as programmatic.

[97] From the fourth century B.C. and probably the late third century B.C.

[98] For the general importance of Nicander for Ovid's work see Plaehn (1882).

Latona are driven away by the cowherds and peasants (respectively); but the primary difference here is that Antoninus' cowherds, not recognizing the goddess, believe that watering their cattle takes precedence over the woman bathing her children, while Ovid's Latona seems to be denied water out of spite. In fact, the Ovidian Latona makes a brief, yet pathetic appeal not evident in Antoninus; not only does she only want to quench her thirst, she reminds the colonists that water is a resource available to all, and that she is the mother of two small babies, who are also in need. When the natives twice prevent her from drinking (once before and once after the goddess's appeal), insult her, and make the waters of the lake undrinkable (as opposed to simply driving the goddess away, as occurs in Antoninus' summary), only then does the goddess punish the mortals. At this point the Liberalian and Ovidian narratives diverge. Ovid's story ends with the goddess transforming the peasants into frogs. Antoninus' Leto, after being driven from the fountain, meets wolves, which guide her to the Xanthus. Here she washes her children and, out of gratitude, names the region after the wolves. She then returns to the fountain where she turns the cowherds into frogs.

Ovid's tale of Latona and the *coloni* does not refer lexically to the account as presented by Antoninus, but given the relationship of these two tales, any such allusion would be suspect. Ovid has clearly altered his version with the effect that the two are thematically different. Both are ultimately aitiological stories, but at its core Antoninus' turns on the theme of hospitality,[99] which no longer dominates Ovid's story. By characterizing the goddess as pitiful (shortly after giving birth driven by the anger of Hera and wanting only to drink) and by inserting a pathetic appeal recognizable to any student of rhetoric,[100] the poet underlines the notion that the goddess has been mistreated by the mortals. This shift in focus helps Ovid continue his now well-established theme of *numinis ira*, and it also constitutes a reflective allusion to the general tradition of this tale. The allusion asks the reader to compare Ovid's rendition to those of others which in turn reveals the artifice of his own narrative. Furthermore, Ovid's portrayal of Latona as a victim here reflects back to his previous depiction of her as an avenging goddess.

---

[99] For an overview of the hospitality theme in ancient literature see Hollis (1990), 341-354.

[100] See Anderson (1972), 198-199.

Within the prologue to the story of Latona and the Lycian peasants Ovid inserts three brief allusions, the first of which is an integrative allusion to his own poetry and Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*. The Ovidian narrator, an unknown man (*Met.* 6. 317), relates that a guide once led him past an altar in the middle of a lake in Lycia. The guide explains for which of the immortals the altar was erected: *cui quondam regia coniunx / orbem interdixit*, *quam vix erratica Delos / orantem accepit* ("whom the queenly wife once forbade the world, whom the wandering Delos scarcely accepted when she asked"; *Met.* 6. 332-333). With these verses Ovid once more recalls the literature that features Leto's wanderings. The reader may remember that Pindar makes no mention of Leto's wanderings, choosing instead to emphasize that of Asteria/Delos. The poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* tells of Leto's wanderings (verses 30-50), but here Leto wanders because the various geographical locations fear the power of the unborn god. It is the *Hymn to Delos* that features Hera's anger as the cause of Leto's wanderings, which are paralleled by Asteria's/Delos's peregrinations. The reader may also catch the other source that so recently referred to the wandering pair: Ovid's own *Met.* 6.186-191.

Ovid then twice alludes to Callimachus' wandering island and goddess, but one aspect the Hellenistic poet emphasized, the willingness of Asteria/Delos to accept the pregnant goddess (*Hymn* 4. 196-205), he alters with the use of *vix*: *quam vix erratica Delos / orantem accepit*, *tum cum levis insula nabat* ("whom the wandering Delos scarcely accepted, when she asked, when then when the light island used to float about"; *Met.* 6.333-334). These verses also do not recall the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, where the island is glad for the opportunity to host the god's birth, but is afraid that she has too little to offer (*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 51-60). Just as Callimachus' description of Asteria/Delos as quickly coming to the aid of Leto, and thus running the risk of Hera's revenge, aids him in his praise of the island, Ovid's reflective allusion to both passages aids in his characterization of Latona as pathetic; the goddess was not only scarcely accepted by the island, but shortly after giving birth she must continue her wandering. Furthermore, Ovid appears to refer reflectively to his own earlier description of this event. In her justification for the cessation of Latona's rites Niobe underlines the goddess's unworthiness when searching for a birthplace: *exsul erat mundi, donec miserata vagantem / "hospita tu terris erras, ego" dixit "in undis," /*

instabilemque locum Delos dedit ("she was an exile of the world until, taking pity on the vagrant, she said, 'stranger, you wander the earth as I wander the sea', and Delos gave her an unstable place." *Met.* 6. 189-191).

In the following verses Ovid refers reflectively to two well-known versions of the story of the birth of Apollo and Artemis: *illic incumbens cum Palladis arbore palmae / edidit invita geminos Latona noverca* ("there, leaning on the palm with [the help of] the tree of Pallas, in spite of their step-mother Latona gave birth to twins"; *Met.* 6.335-338). Ovid describes that Latona gave birth to her twins while leaning against a palm tree and with the help of Pallas's olive. This refers reflectively to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, which records that while giving birth Leto clasped a palm tree (verses 16-18):

> *τὴν μὲν ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ, τὸν δὲ κραναῇ ἐνὶ Δήλῳ,*
> *κεκλιμένη πρὸς μακρὸν ὄρος καὶ Κύνθιον ὄχθον,*
> *ἀγχοτάτω φοίνικος, ἐπ' Ἰνωποῖο ῥεέθροις.*
>
> her in Ortygia, and him in rocky Delos, as you rested
> against the great mass of the Cynthian hill hard by a
> palm tree by the streams of Inopus.

Ovid may have also been aware that in other poems Callimachus refers to either the palm or the olive. In his second hymn, which briefly describes the god's birth, he refers to a palm tree on Delos (*Hymn* 2.4-5):

> *ἐπένευσεν ὁ Δήλιος ἡδύ τι φοῖνιξ*
> *ἐξαπίνης, ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἠέρι καλὸν ἀείδει.*
>
> The Delian palm nods pleasantly of a sudden and
> the swan in the air sings sweetly.

But it is the olive tree that Callimachus uses in connection with the birth of Apollo in *Iambi* 4 and 13 respectively (*Iambi* Frr. 194 and 203):[101]

---

[101] For a clear, concise account of the contents of these *Iambi* see Clayman (1980), 23-29; 44-47; as well as Kerkhecker (1999); and Acosta-Hughes (2002). *Iamb 4* is built around the notion of the evils of strife, a common topos of fable. To stay a quarrel between a poet and his rival, the narrator, Callimachus himself, retells the story of the proverbial quarrel between the olive and laurel tree on Mt. Tmolus. The frg. of *Iamb* 13 addresses competition among poets. The first section is comprised of the attacks of the enemies of the poet (Callimachus), the second Callimachus' defense, and the third the ill effects of such contention upon those in the literary field.

τεῦ γ]ὰρ τὸ πρέμνον Δήλιοι φυλάσσουσι; 83
τὸ τ]ῆς ἐλαίης ἥ ἀν[έπαυσ]ε τὴν Λητώ.

Whose trunk do the Delians preserve?
The olive's, which gave rest to Leto.

τοῦδ' οὕνεκ' οὐδὲν πῖον, ἀ[λλὰ] λιμηρὰ
ἕκαστος ἄκροις δακτύλοις ἀποκνίζει,
ὡς τῆς ἐλαίης, ἥ ἀνέπαυσε τὴν Λητώ.

Therefore each one scrapes off the tips of his
fingers not rich things, but hungry morsels,
like those scraped off the olive tree that gave
Leto rest.

Ovid's reflective allusion, however, is to Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*, in which the goddess is depicted as leaning against a palm tree while giving birth (*Hymn* 4.209-211):

λύσατο δὲ ζώνην, ἀπὸ δ' ἐκλίθη ἔμπαλιν ὤμοις
φοίνικος ποτὶ πρέμνον ἀμηχανίης ὑπὸ λυγρῆς
τειρομένη· νότιος δὲ διὰ χροὸς ἔρρεεν ἱδρώς.

And she loosened her girdle and leaned back her
shoulders against the trunk of a palm tree, oppress-
ed by grievous distress, and sweat poured over her
flesh like rain.

It seems that it was not until after the Apollo's birth that the olive tree came into being (*Hymn* 4.260-263):

χρύσεά τοι τότε πάντα θεμείλια γείνετο, Δῆλε,
χρυσῷ δὲ τροχόεσσα πανήμερος ἔρρεε λίμνη,
χρύσειον δ' ἐκόμησε γενέθλιον ἔρνος ἐλαίης,
χρυσῷ δὲ πλήμυρε βαθὺς Ἰνωπὸς ἑλιχθείς.

In that hour, Delos, your foundations became golden:
with gold around your lake flowed all day, and golden
foliage your natal olive tree put forth and with gold
flowed coiled Inopus in deep flood.

Considering Ovid's verses once more it seems that the poet's juxtapostion of the two trees syntactically reflects upon the palm and

olive which are associated with Apollo in Callimachus *Hymn to Delos*.[102]

In this chapter we have twice examined how Callimachus employs a technique, first seen in Homer, whereby he authorizes alterations in his version of a tale by placing them in the mouths of credible characters.[103] His alterations are not only authorized as "true" for the audience, they are simultaneously "markers" of reflective allusions, points at which the poet encourages his reader to refer to other texts. Ovid too uses this technique when he places his innovations to the Niobe-story in the queen's mouth, thus authorizing the alterations to her tale.[104] But the poet's characterization of Niobe is such that the reader may indeed question her statements. Thus Ovid uses the authorization technique as a more overt "marker" for his reflective allusions. Though we have no accounts prior to Ovid's, when we consider his tale of Latona and the Lycian *coloni* it seems likely that he made changes from the traditional story as recorded by Antoninus. The reflective allusions in this story, however, are not placed in the mouth of a divinity or the main character of the story. Instead the poet places the entire story within the mouth of an unknown narrator. Ovid emphasizes this himself with *e quibus unus ait* (*Met.* 6.317), then further underlines the "anti-authorization" by informing the reader that the story is obscure, *res obscura* (*Met.* 6.319), and through the obscurity of the protagonists, *ignobilitate virorum* (*Met.* 6.319). The ultimate effect of this inverse authorization technique is to not only indicate the reflective allusions in the passage, but to point up the poet's artifice.

The starting point of this chapter was the hypothesized relation of three characters, Asteria/Delos, Leto, and Niobe, which appear in Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 and the first half of *Metamorphoses* 6. The foregoing examination of Ovid's allusions in this section of his poem has indicated that he was well aware of the content of Callimachus' work. When we consider Ovid's nexus of stories and characters we find that he shares with Callimachus the poetic technique of shifting focus away from that of his literary predecessors. In this collection of tales the central figure of Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*, Asteria/Delos,

---

[102] The phrase γενέθλιον ἔρνος ἐλαίης is somewhat problematic. Mineur (1984) 214-215 explains it as a "'birthday sapling', the young olive-tree that sprung forth on the occasion of Apollo's birth."

[103] See pp. 120-122.

[104] See p. 148.

is sidelined to three very brief mentions (*Met.* 6.108; 189-191; 333-334). The story of Niobe's crime and punishment, which constitutes only 4 verses in the *Hymn to Delos* (*Hymn* 4.95-98), becomes a lengthy dramatization of the queen's character and the slaughter of her children. Finally, Ovid included the relatively unknown tale of Latona's wanderings *after* the birth of her divine twins, with the goddess and *coloni* characterized so that there is a shift away from the aitiological and the theme of hospitality toward the victimization of the goddess and her resulting anger.

The issue of the genre of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is vexed, and when we contemplate genre in connection with the stories of Asterie/Delos, Niobe, and Latona, we run up against the additional complication of whether to consider each story as a separate entity or as a portion of the entire poem, or both. Scholars do agree that the *Metamorphoses* contain elements of many genres.[105] The Niobe-episode, for example, was most probably influenced by drama, perhaps one or more tragedies that retold this particular myth; the relatively long speech in which Niobe characterizes herself and the very lengthy description of the death of her children show a strong resemblance to tragedy in form and the total effect of such dramatization.[106] Yet within this episode we find the elements of hymn—the character of Niobe, perhaps interrupting a hymn or prayer to Latona, hymns or prays to herself. The *Du-Stil* is replaced by forms of *ego* (*Met.* 6. 177; 178; 179), each time introducing one aspect of her own eminence, and her entire speech enumerates her ancestry, her power, her wealth, and her accomplishment—the production of children.[107] Latona's plea to the Lycian coloni borrows from the genre of rhetoric. The goddess constructs her argument around the principles of universal law: the elements are available for all (*Met.* 6.351); they are not the private property of any individual (*Met.* 6.350); therefore she should be able to drink from the lake. Finally Latona resorts to the courtroom device of bringing in the tearful children of the defendant (*Met.* 6.358-359). Of course all three stories owe something to the aetiological story. Within

---

[105] For example, see Keith (2002), which examines Ovid's use of epic, elegy, and tragedy in the first five books of his epic.

[106] See p. 146. Tragedies usually begin with a character describing the circumstances of the action, but also him/herself indirectly; messenger speeches were often reserved to describe violent ends that could not be performed on stage.

[107] See Anderson (1972), 176-177.

and between these tales there is a free interplay of genre; Ovid seems to draw from all genres that help him achieve the effect he desires.

That Ovid may be less discriminate than Callimachus in his allusions to and use of sources and genres has been discussed by Clauss in connection with the episode of Latona and the Lycian peasants.[108] The main point of contention between the goddess and the peasants is ownership or control of the water source. As Clauss points out, this dispute may be the "vehicle for reflections on poetry"[109] because: the first story in this series of stories connected thematically, the contest between the Muses and the Pierides over the possession of the Hippocrene, which is the most famous poetic source for water, parallels that of Latona and the peasants; the idea of going to a source of water was often representative of acquiring poetic inspiration, and the nature and quality of the water would be important; Latona makes the nature and quality of the water a central issue; poets often employed certain terminology in their programmatic statements, especially those who identified themselves as Callimachean; Ovid uses such terminology in his narrative. Latona goes to the pool (called *stagnum*, *Met.* 6.320; 6.269; 6.373; *lacus*, 6.325; 6.343; 6.364; and *palus*, 6.345 and 6.372) in order to drink, which recalls the image of a poet who goes to a water source for inspiration. The goddess calls the water *tenuis* (*Met.* 6.351), which Latin poets regularly used to translate the Callimachean λεπτός / λεπταλέος. Latona declares that she is so thirsty she cannot speak; *haustus* was used as a draught of poetic waters and the goddess's inability to speak could be analogous to a poet's inability to write without inspiration. The peasants jealous of their pool could be compared to Callimachus' Telchines or Phthonos and the muddy waters they create are Callimachean symbols for bad poetry. Finally, the peasants' punishment of being transformed into frogs parallels the ill-sounding animals many poets describe their literary competitors to be.[110]

An examination of what Latona might be expressing in poetic terms reveals a revision of Callimachean literary terminology. The goddess believes that the *tenues undae* are available to all; this pool is public (*Met.* 6.351). This is in opposition to Callimachus' aversion to "the

---

[108] Clauss (1989), 297-314.

[109] Clauss (1989), 299.

[110] E.g. Pindar's crows (*O.* 2.83-88); and jackdaws (*N.* 3.76-82); Callimachus' ass (*Aet.* 1.30); and ibis (*Ibis* 381-2); Theocritus's roosters (*Id.* 7.47-8). See also Clauss (1989), n. 13.

public" (*Ep*. 28.3b-4). In other words, Latona tells the reader that good poetry is open to all (*Met*. 6.349), that the source of such poetry is not a remote spring frequented by few, but a public water source open to all. This sort of rearticulation of Callimachean aesthetics is not new. We have seen in in the proem to the *Metamorphoses*, and it can be found in Virgil and Horace.[111] Therefore the goddess seems to suggest that popular and classical topics and genres (*publica munera*) to which all have access (*usus communis aquarum est*) are sources for producing good poetry (*gelidi liquores* and *tenues undae*). If the tale of Latona and the Lycian peasants is programmatic, if the subtext of this story is a revision of what constitutes a Callimachean poem, it would explain why Ovid appears to have alluded to many disparate sources and genres.

Clauss also asserts a connection between the tale of Latona and the peasants with that of the Pierides and the Muses (*Met*. 5.250-678); Arachne and Minerva (*Met*. 6.1-145); Niobe and Latona (*Met*. 6.146-312): and Marsyas and Apollo (*Met*. 6.382-400).[112] The larger issue of this series of tales is the overwhelming desire for "proprietary rights" to a place, position or activity,[113] and each of the contest "losers" strives toward exclusive control of something. The larger subtext of these stories would appear to be that the poet need not avoid the retelling of popular themes or stories; a poem need only be Callimachean in style.

Conclusion II

The three stories examined in this chapter reveal that Ovid's allusive activity is less systematic than Callimachus'. Whereas the allusions of the *Hymn to Delos* are predominantly to two authors and two genres who share themes and genres with Callimachus, we see that Ovid's allusive program, as far as can be revealed through extant literature, is less discriminate. Ovid does indeed integrate elements of Callimachus'

---

[111] See Thomas (1986), 61-73, who has shown that in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* Virgil was trying create a new poetic programme combining the Callimachean with Augustan themes. Also Brink (1971), 131, who has commented on Horace's *Ars Poetica*, (131-136), which is clearly inspired by Callimachus, but the terminology seems to contradict this aesthetic.

[112] Clauss (1989), 306-309.

[113] Clauss (1989), 309.

Hymn 4 into his stories, and like his Hellenistic predecessor he regularly shifts the traditional focus of tales, and he too employs the authorization technique, which often signals reflective allusions and the poet's own creative activity. On the other hand, Ovid's reflective allusions, allusions that compel the reader to refer back to other texts, allusions that point to alteration, demonstrate that the poet borrowed, and changed, freely from many different sources and genres in order to create his own tales. If we can read a subtext in the story of Latona and the peasants that speaks of a rearticulation of Callimachean aesthetics, then Ovid's allusive technique in this portion of his poem may lend support to this idea.

CHAPTER FIVE

BOUNDARIES OF GENRE? ALLUSION AND GENRE

Publica materies privati iuris erit, si
non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem,
nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus
interpres nec desilies imitator in artum,
unde pedem proferre pudor vetet aut operis lex.

Public subjects will become your private property if you neither plod along the common and beaten track nor as faithful translator take the trouble to match your model word for word, nor as an imitator throw yourself into difficulties where either your own pride or generic law keeps you from extending your foot.
(Horace *Ars Poetica* 131-5)

Introduction

Once upon a time there lived a man, perhaps a young man, in Thessaly whose name was Erysichthon. Erysichthon willfully violated a grove dedicated to the goddess Demeter, and to punish him the goddess inflicted a burning hunger upon him – hence his by-name "Aethon". The man's family, or some say that it was the man himself, used every means to appease his insatiable hunger. Some say that he sold his own daughter so he could buy more food. Others say that once he had consumed everything, his royal family finally ejected him from the home to beg at a crossroads. This is the bare outline of the fairy tale told by Callimachus and Ovid, which each chooses to fill out in such a way that he creates his own unique story. This study of Callimachean and Ovidian allusion concludes with another look at the Erysichthon tale as told by each poet. Other discussions of this story have focused on either Callimachus' or Ovid's treatment of it, sometimes adding brief comparisons of the two that ultimately favor Callimachus' economical

and "more tasteful" version.[1] This chapter attempts to look at these two treatments separately, giving each treatment equal weight, and, of course, from the perspective of the poets' allusive techniques.

This chapter will focus on how Callimachus' and Ovid's use of alternating reflective and integrative allusions, which refer to various genres, contrasts with the apparent genres of their own poems and injects the textures of other genres into their poems. The result is that the tone of each narrative constantly shifts and the reader is never confronted with "the expected" for long. This allusive technique is one that suggests the destabilization of the boundaries of poetic genre, that calls attention to the mechanics of poetic composition, and is one that, from the different perspective of poetic allusion, serves to confirm the commonly held view that the tone of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid and Callimachus' poetry shifts constantly.[2]

For example, in his *Hymn to Demeter* Callimachus, as we observed previously in his *Hymn to Delos*, alludes integratively to the hymnic genre by incorporating into the poem several generic signatures which authorize his poem as belonging to the tradition of Greek hymn. Ironically, however, the poet's attempt to place this hymn within a setting appropriate for a hymn, i.e. a mimetic frame, undermines this authorization. Leading into the narrative of the hymn the poet prepares the reader for an unanticipated story by using a combination of reflective and integrative allusions that also introduce the notion of another genre into the hymn. In the narrative proper Callimachus portrays Erysichthon to a great extent via allusions, once more both reflective and integrative, to still another genre-epic.

Within his version of Erysichthon's story Ovid alludes integratively and reflectively to Homer and Virgil, and in doing so, like Callimachus, introduces—or rather re-introduces—the epic genre into his poem and alternatively reflects this introduction with his own treatment. The effect of this manner of allusion is a narrative of uneven tone, and also a narrative that self-consciously plays with generic boundaries. Ovid's reflective allusions in his characterization of Erysichthon to Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter* serve to distinguish his

---

[1] See for example Bulloch (1985), 22-24, and Anderson (1972), 403-416.

[2] See, for example, Bulloch (1989), 9-30, for a description from another perspective of the shifting tones (due to the poet's insertion of "other" genres) of Callimachus' work. For a general overview of how Ovid injects other genres within his epic see Kenney (1982), 134-145.

treatment, but ultimately it is the poet's references to Callimachus that unify a large portion of Book 8 of the *Metamorphoses*.

Two Erysichthons

One version of Erysichthon's tale comes to us within the mimetic frame of Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*. The speaker of this hymn tells the reader rather indirectly that this poem unfolds during a celebration of Demeter.[3] The speaker calls upon Demeter, the goddess of plenty (*Hymn* 6.2), instructs the participants (*Hymn* 6.3-6), and as she indicates the arrival of Hesperus, reveals that the participants' privations are drawing to an end (*Hymn* 6.7-9). This provokes the speaker to recall Demeter's own deprivations while searching for her 'lost' daughter (*Hymn* 6.10-16). The hymn's speaker, however, does not wish to fully recall a story so sad for the goddess. Instead, she mentions the goddess' other concerns: she is a law-giver (*Hymn* 6.18) and an instructor in the art of agriculture (*Hymn* 6.19-21). The subsequent two verses (*Hymn* 6.22-23), though damaged, most probably introduced the tale of Erysichthon. Once this story has been told, the hymn draws to a close with the hymn's speaker calling upon Demeter once more and expressing the hope that she may in no way associate with those who, like the young man, offend the goddess (*Hymn* 6.116-117). Then moving once more into the mimetic frame, the speaker indicates that the anticipated procession draws near and expresses the hope that the goddess will look kindly upon them all (*Hymn* 6.118-123).

The story told while the women await the procession is that of Erysichthon's violation of Demeter's wood and her punishment of him. The Pelasgians had grown a grove sacred to Demeter (*Hymn* 6.24-32), which the young Erysichthon and twenty retainers enter in order to chop down the goddess' trees (*Hymn* 6.32-36). The first tree chosen was a favorite of the nymphs, a huge poplar (*Hymn* 6.37-38). Once this tree is struck it cries out in pain and the goddess, disguised as her own priestess Nicippe, appears to Erysichthon, asking him to stop and warning him of possible punishment should he continue (*Hymn* 6.39-49). Erysichthon fiercely rejects her advice, telling her that the tree will roof

[3] Like the mimetic *Hymn* 5, the poet does not identify the narrator of the hymn, though it is plainly not Callimachus himself but is a participant in the ritual. Also like the fifth *Hymn* the narrator here seems to be female. See Hopkinson (1984), 35-43.

his banqueting hall (*Hymn* 6.50-55). Demeter then reveals herself and informs him of the punishment for his impudent actions (*Hymn* 6.56-64). Erysichthon is seized by an insatiable hunger (*Hymn* 6.65-67), and at this point the narrative takes a curious and unexpected turn; the speaker then describes the young man's illness in terms of the embarrassment it produces for his family (*Hymn* 6.68-95). The young man's father even calls upon his own father, Poseidon, for help (*Hymn* 6.96-110). When Erysichthon has eaten all the family's resources, his parents turn him out to beg for food at the crossroads (*Hymn* 6.111-115). Without a hint of the transgressor's end the tale ends and the speaker returns once more to the mimetic frame (*Hymn* 6.116-123).

Ovid's version of the Erysichthon tale (*Met.* 8.738-878) is set within not one frame, but several.[4] The story occurs within the Athenian cycle of the tales concerning Theseus. The hero encounters the river god, Achelous, who entertains Theseus and his companions by telling several stories. A brief story explaining Proteus' ability to change his own form precedes the Erysichthon tale, which is in fact embedded within the story of Mestra.[5] The stories of Mestra and Proteus are linked by the theme of shape-shifting, though the tale of Erysichthon partially obscures the connection. Achelous begins his tale concerning Erysichthon by mentioning his daughter, but before the narrator can tell her story, he must first relate how she came to possess her power: this is the tale of Erysichthon.

The reader discovers immediately that Erysichthon is impious (*Met.* 8.739-740), and that he violated a grove sacred to Ceres by ordering his servants to cut down a particularly large oak that was favored by the dryads (*Met.* 8.741-750). When one servant abstains from cutting the tree, Erysichthon himself decapitates him, and strikes the tree (*Met.* 8.751-756). The dying tree warns Erysichthon of his impending punishment, but he continues nevertheless (*Met.* 8.771-773). The dryads ask Ceres to punish the man, and the goddess then sends an oread to tell Hunger to attack Erysichthon (*Met.* 8.774-795). The oread delivers the goddess' message to Hunger, who is vividly described, and Hunger

---

[4] For an overview of the contents of this book of the *Metamorphoses* see von Albrecht (2003), 141.

[5] See Fantham (1993), 21-36, esp. 30-31, for an examination of Ovid's Mestra tale, as well as his stories of Thetis, and Vertumnus, as *variatio* of a traditional folk-tale, the shape-shifter story. Leach makes the point that Ovid has innovated the plot of this basic story type by grafting onto it "a typical disguise motif of comedy". One could add that Ovid then grafts this new combination onto the folk-tale of Erysichthon.

infects the sleeping Erysichthon (*Met.* 8.796-822). A fierce hunger begins while he sleeps and upon awaking his eating becomes limitless (*Met.* 8.823-842). Erysichthon eventually consumes all his wealth except his daughter, whom he sells (*Met.* 8.843-848). Once sold she escapes her master and begs Poseidon, whom the reader learns had raped the girl, to come to her aid (*Met.* 8.848-851). The god gives her the ability to change form, which she does to elude her new master (*Met.* 8.852-569). The girl returns to her previous form, returns home, where her father sells her repeatedly. Each time she escapes her master by changing form (*Met.* 8.870-874). Even this, however, proves to be insufficient for Erysichthon's hunger and eventually he consumes himself (*Met.* 8.875-878).

Sources for the Erysichthon Tale

A comparison of the extant sources for the Erysichthon tale to Callimachus' and Ovid's versions of the story indicates that, not surprisingly, in some respects both poets appear to have simplified the story and, where various accounts contradict one another, the poets seem to have selected or created particular elements based upon the needs of their narrative.[6] An overview of the most important extant versions of the Erysichthon tale will give a general impression of how the poets may have created their own renditions of the story with the sources available to them.

A fragment from Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* (Fr. 43a2-69) focuses upon Erysichthon's daughter, Mestra. Here we learn that Erysichthon, the son of Triopas, possessed the nickname Aethon because of his raging hunger (verses 2-11). Mestra supports her father by allowing herself to be sold as a bride (not as a slave as Ovid tells the reader), then transforming herself into animal form and returning to her father to be sold again. After a legal dispute with the father of one of Mestra's bridegrooms, Poseidon takes Mestra to Cos where she bears him a son, Eurypylus (verses 55-59).

The primary difference between the Hesiodic and Callimachean text is the character of Mestra, which does not appear in the Hellenistic poet's hymn. Verses 66-67 of the *Hymn to Demeter* suggest that Calli-

[6] See Hopkinson (1984), 18-31, esp. 25 n. 1, and McKay (1962a), 3-60, for more detailed accounts of Callimachus' and Ovid's sources for their versions of this tale.

machus knew of Erysichthon's nickname, Aethon, but it is not entirely clear if these verses were influenced by Hesiod's accounts or by another source in which the pseudonym appeared. Ovid's text, on the other hand, appears to have drawn from the Hesiodic tradition Mestra's ability to transform herself, the need for her to maintain her father because of his raging hunger, her being sold and her subsequent transformations into another form to escape the man to whom she is sold, as well as a relationship with Poseidon.

In Athenaeus (416B = *FGH* 4F7), who quotes Hellanicus,[7] we find Erysichthon's nickname, Aethon, once more, but here his father is called Myrmidon, a name which is not attested elsewhere. However, it seems likely that this source does not contradict Hesiod's account and that McKay is correct when he writes that this paternity must belong to the same general tradition that cites Triopas as Erysichthon's father.[8] Myrmidon was the eponymous hero of the Myrmidons, or Thessalians, and originally Erysichthon was probably referred to as "The Thessalian".

The fragments of a fifth-century satyr play entitled Αἴθων written by the tragedian Achaeus[9] suggest that here Callimachus and Ovid may have found an example of a humorous treatment of Erysichthon's hunger.[10] The fragmentary state of the text, however, makes it impossible to be definite about its precise influence on Callimachus' hymn.

In Lycophron's *Alexandra* (verses 1393-1396) we find the broad details of the Hesiodic story, but here he has adopted a Euhemeristic approach. The poet refers to the daughter of Erysichthon, though he does not mention her name. His use of *βασσάρας* (fox) suggests that she was sold, not as a bride as in Hesiod's account or as a slave as in Ovid's, but as a prostitute, to finance her father's hunger. Aethon is here referred to using a participle of *γητομέω* (the Doric form *γατομοῦντος*), which may be a reference to the etymology of Erysichthon's name.[11]

A fragment ascribed to Nicander, whose *Heteroeumena* influenced Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* appears to follow the Hesiodic tradition of the

---

[7] Athenaeus 416b (=FGH 4f7), who is later quoted by Aelian *V.H.* 1.27 and Eustathius 862.7.

[8] McKay (1962a), 8.

[9] *TrGF* 20F6-11 Snell, Frr. 4-8 Steffen

[10] See Hopkinson (1984), 20, and McKay (1962a), 22-26.

[11] See Hopkinson (1984), 21 and Hollis (1970), 129 who writes that Lycophron "used Aethon as a recherché synonym for Erysichthon."

story.[12] These lines refer to a daughter by the name of Hypermestra who helps to feed the raging hunger of her father, Aethon. Another very brief reference to this story occurs in the Suda in an entry for *αἴθων*. There is no mention of the name Erysichthon, but here we find confirmation outside Callimachus' and Ovid's accounts for the crime of tree-felling connected to Erysichthon.[13] Unfortunately, the source for this entry is unknown, and it is impossible to determine if it reflects the tale as it is recounted in Callimachus and Ovid or some other, earlier or later, source.[14] In a scholium to Lycophron[15] we find Erysichthon's tree-felling and Mestra's ability to transform herself in one narrative, but once again the date and the source are unknown. Finally, in Diodorus Siculus (*Bibliotheca* 5.61) we find a version that makes no mention of Erysichthon: Triopas is the villain.

The modern Greek folk-tale, "Myrmidoniá and Pharaoniá", also known as the Coan Tale, was first published in 1950 and contains several parallels to both Ovid's and Callimachus' versions of the Erysichthon story.[16] The first publisher of this supposed variant of Erysichthon's tale believed it to be a survival of this story ante-dating both Ovid's and Callimachus' tales, a view which some classical scholars find appealing.[17] In his discussion of the Erysichthon myth Fehling demonstrates that such a survival is extremely unlikely.[18] Rather more convincing is Kenney's argument that the Coan Tale is modern and was derived from a Greek translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* made by Maximus Planudes.[19]

When we set all of these accounts next to those of Callimachus and Ovid we can draw some general conclusions. One way in which Callimachus differs from all accounts, even Ovid's, is that he does not make use of the Mestra element of the Erysichthon tale. This does not necessarily imply that Callimachus did not know Hesiod as a source, or that

---

[12] In Antoninus Liberalis 17.5 = Nicander Fr. 45 Schn. See Vollgraff (1909).

[13] Hesiod may have referred to tree-felling in his Mestra-story, but the fragmentary nature of his account makes it impossible to determine.

[14] In any case the account in the Suda post-dates Callimachus' and Ovid's tales.

[15] *Schol*. Lycophron 1393-6, vol. 2 p. 384 Scheer (= Hes. fr. 43b), which also post-dates Callimachus' and Ovid's versions.

[16] The tale was first published by Dawkins (1950); see Hopkinson (1984), 28 and Hollis (1970), 131 for parallels between the Coan Tale and Ovid's, as well as Callimachus', version.

[17] For example, McKay, (1962a), 33-60 and, with some reservations, Hollis (1970), 130-132.

[18] See Fehling (1972), 185-195.

[19] Kenney (1963), 57; see also Otis (1970), 427.

he relied upon a source no longer extant. It could mean that Callimachus elected to expand upon the notion of Erysichthon's hunger and its repercussions. Ovid on the other hand seems to have based his account on the Hesiodic, as well as the Callimachean, tradition. Besides Callimachus and Ovid, the only two sources that link Erysichthon's crime of tree-felling with hunger as punishment are the Suda and perhaps the Lycophron scholium, whose sources are impossible to date. While it seems reasonable to say that Ovid incorporated into his own story the relationship of tree-felling and Erysichthon's punishment of insatiable hunger as seen in Callimachus, it seems unlikely that Callimachus fabricated this incident.[20] It is, of course, possible that Callimachus was influenced by a source no longer extant. Another possibility is that he was influenced by the similar tree-felling of the father of Paraebius as narrated in Apollonius' *Argonautica* (*Argo*. 2.468-489).[21]

Callimachus' Hymn to Demeter*, Integrative Allusion, and the Dislocation of Genre*

In the previous chapter we saw that Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 possesses many of the features of a traditional Greek hymn, and that by incorporating the generic signatures of a hymn into his poem Callimachus authenticates the poem as belonging to the hymnic tradition and, more generally speaking, one may say that he alludes integratively to the genre "hymn".[22] In Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter* the reader rapidly detects the signatures of the hymnic genre. A single divinity is addressed in a direct manner, that is to say in the *Du-Stil*, both of which are common features of the *Homeric Hymns*.[23] The poem is hexametric, which is not necessarily a strong feature of the hymnic genre (though all the *Homeric Hymns* are hexametric), but the speaker's hortatory imperative is standard in cult hymns, as is the cletic repetition of verses 1 and 3.[24] Once the reader reaches the end of the poem he finds that the focus is upon the narrative, as is usual in *Homeric Hymns*, and that specific elements of its ending recall the hymnic genre. The χαῖρε formula is a common form to conclude hymns, and the prayer of verse

[20] It is not Callimachus' standard poetic practice to create stories; see p. 77.
[21] As identified in Cuypers (forthcoming), introductory remarks on 2.455-490.
[22] See pp. 116-118.
[23] Furley and Bremer (2001), 2.
[24] Hopkinson (1984), 78-79.

137 is quite usual, especially as a coda in the Orphic hymns.[25] The effect of the incorporation of these generic signatures is that the poem is authenticated as a hymn belonging to the tradition of Greek hymns, and as discussed in the previous chapter, these signatures *en masse* may be considered an integrative allusion to the hymnic genre.

Further reinforcing the impression that this poem may be categorized as a hymn is the "epic" or hymnic subject matter of the first portion of the narrative (verses 24-67);[26] the goddess justly punishes a transgressor. This traditional hymnic subject and the integrative allusions to the hymnic genre, all of which encourage the reader to consider this poem a traditional hymn, are then subverted by the concentration on more "modern" subject matter in the second part of the hymn;[27] by the Doric *Kunstsprache*, which is itself heavily indebted to the language of epic, but is interesting in the context of a hexameter hymn, and by elements of choral lyric that are introduced into the poem, both of which inject this hexametric hymn with elements of the choral lyric hymn;[28] by the indeterminacy of the identity of the festival and the festival location;[29] by elements of choral lyric that are introduced into the poem;[30] and the emphasis of the immediacy of the scene.[31] Another perspective from which to view the allusions to the hymnic tradition is from the mimetic frame in which Callimachus placed the generic signatures. The reader approaching *Hymn* 6 is struck first by the poet's attempt to recreate an environment that refuses to be definitively identified but in which a hymn might be recited. Then the reader takes notice of the integrative allusions to the generic form of "hymn", as well as those to choral lyric. Despite

---

[25] Hopkinson (1984), 183, 186.

[26] Hopkinson (1984), Bulloch (1977), 99-101 who states that the structure of Callimachus' hymn up to this point is similar to the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* and is traditional.

[27] On this portion of the narrative that focuses upon the social repercussions of Erysichthon's insatiable hunger on his family, see Hopkinson (1984), 11-12.

[28] Hunter and Fuhrer (2001), 148, theorize that Callimachus uses the Doric dialect here and in *Hymn* 5 because the *Lavacrum Palladis* was 'set' in Doric Argos, and during the composition the poet may have been influenced by the dialect of Doric sources; that the imaginary locale of recitation of the *Hymn to Demeter* is (perhaps purposely) uncertain, but it would not have been out of place in Cyrene; and finally, that both hymns are an imitation of public choral poetry of the archaic polis in which Doric was the dialect that colored the language. See Hopkinson (1984), 3 and Depew (1993), 58-59 and n. 10.

[29] Hopkinson (1984), 3-4 and Depew (1993), 65-66.

[30] Hopkinson (1984), 3 and Depew (1993), 58-59 and n. 10.

[31] Depew (1993), 65.

Callimachus' attempt to authenticate his poem as a hymn, then, the mimetic frame dislocates the generic identification.

The Preparatory Allusions

Given Callimachus' reluctance to commit this poem to the hymnic genre entirely it is not surprising that the poet emphasizes the distinctiveness of his hymn. He begins by inserting two reflective allusions into the opening scene, both of which signal very early in the poem that this hymn may be different from other hymns to Demeter.[32] The first of these, the mention of Hesperus in verses 7-9, seems to function as the first indicator of dissimilarity. Of course, on the surface of the poem the most obvious use of the reference to the star is that within the mimetic frame its appearance conveys the approach of evening, thus the end of the procession and fasting honoring the goddess. The speaker's assertion that Hesperus encouraged Demeter to drink while she was searching for Persephone (verses 8-9) urges the reader to recall other, very different characters who cheered her up as well.[33] In this way the reference to Hesperus alludes reflectively to other, dissimilar instances of this scene, and it indicates that what may unfold in this hymn to the goddess may be different.

The ensuing verses (*Hymn* 6.10-16), act as a general allusion to other versions of the tale of Persephone's abduction, Demeter's search for her, and their eventual reunion.[34] A few details mark this as a reflective allusion. The number three is a recurring element of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*: Demeter wanders for 9 (three times three) days; the gods try to appease Demeter three times; Persephone must dwell in the underworld for a third of the year; this justification for the seasons is repeated three times; and Demeter together with Persephone

---

[32] See Bing (1996), 29-42 who examines points of contact between Callimachus' *Hymn* 6 and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, most different than those examined here (and with conclusions contrasting to those presented here) because the author focuses on the similarities of content and structure between the two hymns. See also Fantuzzi (1993), 927-946 who denies the influence of the *Homeric Hymns* on Callimachus' *Hymn* 5 and 6. Bulloch (1977), compares *Hymn* 6 to the structure of the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*.

[33] In the *Homeric Hymn* it is Metaneira (verses 195-205) and in the Orphic Hymn Baubo (Orph. *Fr.* 52) who urge Demeter to drink while she is searching for her daughter.

[34] Extant versions include abbreviated accounts in Hesiod (*Th.* 912-914); Euripides (*Hel.* 1301-1368); and the lengthier *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.

and Hecate form a triad. Callimachus also deploys the number three, as the author of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* does, but differently: the goddess cross the Achelous three times (*Hymn* 6.13), each of the other rivers on earth three times (*Hymn* 6.14), and she sits three times beside the well of Callichorus (*Hymn* 6.15). To further underscore this triad, he employs the triple anaphora of *τρὶς…τοσσάκι…τρὶς* ("three times…as often…three times"; *Hymn* 6.13-15). Furthermore, Callimachus does not mention, as do the *Theogony* and the *Homeric Hymn*, that Persephone was given to Hades as a bride, nor does he mention the joyful reunion of Demeter and Persephone. This general reflective allusion to other versions of the tale of Demeter's search for her daughter is anchored by reflective lexical allusion of *τρὶς ἐπὶ Καλλιχόρῳ χαμάδις ἐκαθίσσαο* ("and you sat on the ground beside the fountain Callichorus three times"; *Hymn* 6.15). This seems to contradict the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, in which the goddess sits beside the Well of the Maiden (*Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 98-99), and Callichorus is the site of Demeter's temple at Eleusis.[35] But just as the reader expects, and perhaps hopes, to read what the poet has signaled as an obviously different rendition of the story of Persephone's abduction and her mother's search for her, the poet halts the progress of this tale, switches gears, and begins another narrative (*Hymn* 6.17).

To emphasize that his hymn is different from other hymns Callimachus makes two integrative allusions to another genre, Hesiod's *Works and Days,* which draw upon and incorporate into his poem a Hesiodic flavor, which though not altogether foreign to the genre of hymn, are distinctive and identifiable as Hesiodic. The first of these occurs at verse 22, at the point of transition from the mimetic frame to the narrative. The phrase *ὑπερβασίας ἀλέηται* (*Hymn* 6.22) alludes to the final verse of Hesiod's *Works and Days* : *εὐδαίμων… / ὃς τάδε… ἐργάζηται … / ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων* ("blessed is he who accomplishes these things, judging the omens and avoiding transgression" (*Works and Days* 828).[36] Callimachus, like Hesiod, refers to transgressions against the gods. There is no dissonance between contexts here; Hesiod ends one portion of his most obviously didactic and moralistic poem with this notion, and Callimachus alludes to it

---

[35] See Hopkinson (1984), 93.

[36] First noted by West (1969), 3 and Hopkinson (1984), 99 who identifies this as a 'quotation' of Hesiod. Following Conte (1986), 59 I would not categorize this as a quotation, which is a text which an author certifies as being that of another author, but as an allusion.

when beginning a story, thus signaling with this allusion that this tale's purpose is didactic and moralistic as well.

Callimachus closes his Erysichthon story and returns to the mimetic frame with yet another integrative allusion at verses 116-117 that reminds the reader of the narrative's essentially didactic and moral nature: *Δάματερ, μὴ τῆνος ἐμὶν φίλος, ὅς τοι ἀπεχθής, / εἴη μηδ' ὁμότοιχος· ἐμοὶ κακογείτονες ἐχθροί* ("Demeter, never may that man be my friend who is hateful to you, nor ever may he share party-wall with me"; *Hymn* 6.116-117). This alludes to Hesiod's *Works and Days* verses 346-348, *πῆμα κακὸς γείτων, ὅσσον τ' ἀγαθὸς μέγ' ὄνειαρ. / ἔμμορέ τοι τιμῆς, ὅς τ' ἔμμορε γείτονος ἐσθλοῦ. / οὐδ' ἂν βοῦς ἀπόλοιτ', εἰ μὴ γείτων κακὸς εἴη* ("a bad neighbor [is the cause of] evil suffering as much as a good neighbor is a great advantage. He who has gotten his share of a good neighbor has gotten his share of honor. If his neighbor should not be bad, he would not lose a cow"; *Works and Days* 346-348). While the didactic flavor Callimachus alludes to at both the beginning and end of the Erysichthon story is not incompatible with hymns,[37] these allusions also serve to reinforce the notion that this is not a "traditional" hymn, and perhaps provoke the reader to begin to question and examine the boundaries of the hymnic genre.

Callimachus' Erysichthon and Homer

Within the "unepic" and "unheroic" social comedy of the Erysichthon story Callimachus has created a constantly shifting mosaic of allusions, almost all of which are lexically based references to Homer's epics.[38] The integrative allusions insert another genre into the hymn: establishing a heroic tone that is complemented by the Doricizing *Kunstsprache*, and at variance with the traditional Ionic language of the

---

[37] Furley and Bremer (2001), 14-16 discuss "several interesting passages of early Greek poetry in which the Olympian community instructs humans how to worship them by setting an example" (14). Futhermore, the act of reciting a hymn is not only celebration of a god, but didactic in the sense that it teaches the audience how to worship a god.

[38] Hopkinson (1984) views the Erysichthon story as beginning on the "Iliadic plane" before adopting a more "'modern' ethos [within] an archaic setting." Because of the poet's choice to portray Erysichthon as a young man, and because of his preference to concentrate his narrative on the social aspect of the repercussions of Erysichthon's crime, the thrust of the hymn appears to be rather unheroic.

hexameter hymn.[39] When the reader probes more deeply, he finds that in other portions of this Erysichthon story the poet also alludes reflectively to Homer, thus seemingly distancing his poetry from epic by contrasting his own with Homer's poetry. The allusions create either a coalescene or a confrontation of contexts and texts, with the effect that they lend the hymn a heroic or epic flavor that contrasts with the content of the story of Erysichthon. These contrasts then produce a poem in which the unanticipated constantly appears, and the resulting unevenness of the poem emphasizes its own artifice. When we consider this mode of allusive technique in comparison with those already treated we see that the difference is that instead of incorporating one author and reflecting another, Callimachus does both with one author: Homer

After suggesting the moralistic and didactic nature of his hymn with his integrative allusion to Hesiod (*Hymn* 6.22), Callimachus creates a *locus amoenus* (*Hymn* 6.24-28) that one may say recalls Homeric passages (and those of other poets as well) such as the cave of Calypso (*Od*. 5.63-73; *αἴγειρος* (poplar) *Od*. 5.64; *κρῆναι* (springs) *Od*. 5.70); Alcinuous' gardens (*Od*. 7.114-132; *δένδρεα* (trees) *Od*. 7.114; *ὄγχναι* (pear trees) *Od*. 7.115; *μηλέαι* (apple trees) *Od*. 7.115; *δύω κρῆναι* (two springs) *Od*. 7.129), and the fountain on Ithaca (*Od*. 17.208-211; *ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αἰγείρων ὑδατοτρεφέων ἦν ἄλσος,/ πάντοσε κυκλοτερές, κατὰ δὲ ψυχρὸν ῥέεν ὕδωρ / ὑψόθεν ἐκ πέτρης· βωμὸς δ' ἐφύπερθε τέτυκτο / νυμφάων*; "and around it [a public fountain] was a grove of black poplars, trees that grow by / water, all in a circle, and there was cold water pouring / down from the rock above; over it had been built an altar for the nymphs.").[40] These verbal parallels probably indicate not necessarily immediate lexically-based allusions, or allusions to a particular source-passage, but Callimachus' reliance on a common formula first seen in Homer and developed by later poets. On the other hand, we may call Callimachus' use of this topos an integrative allusion to *loci amoeni* that urges the reader to recall not one particular place described by a certain poet, or the significance of a species of

[39] Hunter and Fuhrer (2001), 148.

[40] Callimachus has created here a *locus amoenus*, a grove constituted by a variety of trees, water, and we can assume shade and quiet. For the usual elements of such scenes see *RE* 7.768-783, 16.2.1820-1885; Curtius (1953), 185-186 for Homeric examples of *loci amoeni*; 192 for the history of *locus amoenus* as a technical term; and 195 for a definition of the pattern of *loci amoeni*. See also Hopkinson (1984), 5 and 102-103, who lists the verbal parallels that link the Homeric and Callimachean passages.

tree, but instead, this allusion draws upon the notion all *loci amoeni* share: this is a very special, perhaps sacred, place that possesses a feeling of enchantment like that which surrounds Calypso's cave and Alcinous' garden.[41] Naturally, one may question how Callimachus can allude to a topos, a commonplace. By its very nature a topos seems to suggest that it is so common that it can not be an allusion – a reference to one or perhaps two locations. However, if we, following Conte, consider how texts relate to one another, this dilemma of an allusive topos will be solved. In an example that illustrates his point, for Virgil's *Aeneid* Homer's epics were the "exemplary model",[42] i.e. "the model constituted by the accretation of a series of individual imitations"[43] which involves the reproduction of a single *loci*. But Homer is also the "code model"[44], i.e. "the representative of the institution of epic poetry itself"; this involves the assimilation of "rules and codifications." So in the words of another scholar, allusion may include modelling by particular source-passage and modelling by code.

Callimachus presents this idyllic scene, drawing on the reader's memories of enchanted gardens and groves of Homer, then near the end of the description describes the amber-colored water as boiling up in ditches (*τὸ δ' ὥστ' ἀλέκτρινον ὕδωρ / ἐξ ἀμαρᾶν ἀνέθυε.* "and water gushed up from the ditches like amber"; *Hymn* 6.28-29). Particular elements of these two verses stand out. In these verses are couched two reflective lexical allusions that ask the reader to import a Homeric context into a very different Callimachean one. It is not unusual that the poet describes the color of the water in the grove, but the adjective he chooses is unusual. This modifier was used in antiquity for the substance we call amber and the alloy of gold and silver, electrum. But here, *ἀλέκτρινον* refers to neither substance, but to a color produced and alludes reflectively to the appearance of Paris in his armour (*Il.* 6.513-514) and that of Achilles in the memorable arming scene (*Il.* 19.398).

---

[41] Cahen (1930), 264 concentrates on the types of trees Homer and Callimachus describe, while McKay (1962a), 77 points out that the species of tree is not of primary importance. Simple artistic *variatio* may account for differences. See also Müller (1987), 12n.18, who believes that what Callimachus describes is a "künstliche Landschaft, nicht nur als literarisches Konstrukt im Sinne des topischen *Locus amoenus*" with more in common with a Ptolemaic garden than a naturally occurring wood.

[42] Conte (1986), 31.

[43] Both of the broader definitions are those of Hinds (1998), who offers an excellent discussion about the mutable boundaries of the definitions of topos and allusion in relation to one another, 34-47.

[44] Conte (1986), 31.

The unexpected use of this adjective in this context calls attention to the verse, and once he places this use next to the Homeric passages, he conjures up the general connotation of a beautiful gleaming of armor donned for conflict. The implicit message of these allusions is that though the sacred grove is beautiful and magical, conflict will be associated with it.

The completion of the statement begun in verse 28 also foreshadows imminent violence. Callimachus describes the amber-colored water as seething. The verb ἀνέθυε ("burst forth"; *Hymn* 6.29) is unusual and is certainly an unexpected addition to this *locus amoenus.*[45] This word does harken back to *Iliad* 21.234 and 23. 230, where θύω is used of the raging of the Scamander and of the Thracian sea.[46] The description of the goddess' feeling about this grove further foreshadows the coming action. She ἐπεμαίνετο ("is madly fond of"; *Hymn* 6.29) this wood, which is an odd word choice given that it is a Homeric *hapax legomenon,* and that it is used to describe the romantic feelings Anteia has for Bellephontes. This reflective allusion colors the goddess' feelings for the sacred grove, together with the above allusion it helps to foreshadow the coming violence. It also helps explain Demeter's reaction a few verses later to the violation of her grove. Both reflective allusions call attention to themselves, they urge the reader to pull the emotionally charged Homeric scenes into Callimachus' idyllic description and adumbrate the violence that will take place within the grove. To further underscore the violence of Erysichthon's deed, Callimachus then alludes integratively to the Homeric phrase πελέκεσσι καὶ ἀξίναισιν ("with double axes and hatchets"; *Il.* 15.711). With this allusion the poet incorporates the ferocity of the battle around the Greek ships into his depiction of Erysicthon's malign intent.

In his portrayal of Demeter in the disguise of her priestess, Nicippe, Callimachus exploits a topos common in ancient literature: a divinity who appears to mortals in disguise and judges their behavior towards the "stranger". But the poet's rendition of this motif constitutes a twofold reflective allusion as well.[47] The Callimachean Nicippe may first

[45] The compound verb appears only here in extant literature. See Hopkinson (1984), 105.

[46] See Hopkinson (1984), 105.

[47] See Hopkinson (1984), 117-118 who lists four occurences in the *Iliad* in which gods (Aphrodite with Helen, 3.383-425; Poseidon with Agamemnon, 14.136-152; Apollo with Aeneas, 17.322-332; and Athena disguises herself as Phoenix, 17.555) assume a disguise of an old person and appear to a human.

recall reflectively the portion of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* in which the goddess appears in disguise to the daughters of Celeus and their mother, who all receive the strange old woman with kindness and respect (*Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 96-117). This recollection contrasts starkly with Erysichthon's reception of the goddess' supposed priestess. Callimachus also alludes reflectively to a rather different scene in the *Iliad* in which the priest of Apollo appears to Agamemnon, who rejects him angrily (*Il.* 1.11-42). The coincidence of the plural form of *στέμματα* and *ἀράτειραν* (which is, of course, *ἀπατῆρα* in Homer) in both texts underscores this allusion.[48] The effect of Callimachus' allusion to the traditional topos, that a human heeds the warning or advice of a divinity in disguise, underscores Erysichthon's profanity, and the allusion to the encounter of Chryses and Agamemnon, effectively comparing the youth to Agamemon, further stresses the youth's hot-headedness and the fact that Erysichthon's reaction will lead to punishment.

Likewise Erysichthon's response to the priestess' warning is a reflective allusion to Homer. Callimachus initiates the formal, epic simile with a comparative adjective followed by *ἤ*, which is a technique of transition from narrative to simile unique to Homer.[49] Epic similes are remarkable within the context of Callimachus' hymns. Therefore when Erysichthon's glare at the goddess is described in these terms (*Hymn* 6.50-52), the reader should immediately sit up and take notice.[50] This simile should remind the reader of something very similar that occurs in quite different circumstances in the *Iliad* at 17.133-136, which Callimachus imports to this passage. Here Ajax stands guard over the body of Patroclus and is compared to a lion standing fast over his young against hunters. The Homeric simile emphasizes the lion's pride in his own great strength and the hooding of his eyes: *ὁ δέ τε σθένει βλεμεαίνει, / πᾶν δέ τ' ἐπισκύνιον κάτω ἕλκεται ὄσσε καλύπτων* ("and in his strength he looks fiercely, drawing his eyebrows down covering his eyes"; *Il.* 17.135-136). Callimachus' reflective allusion to this simile plays up the fact that Erysichthon does not heroically protect the body of a dead comrade in battle; his only intention is to chop down sacred trees for a banquet hall. Even so he

[48] Hopkinson (1984), 6 and 119 and Bulloch (1977), 102-103.
[49] Hopkinson (1984), 124.
[50] The only other examples of formal epic-length similes are *Hymn* 4.141-147 and 4.228-232; Hopkinson (1984), 123.

looks upon the priestess more fiercely than a lioness with newborn cubs (*Hymn* 6.50-51). With this reflective allusion Callimachus imports the Homeric-epic emotion and sense of battle into this scene and underlines the degree of Erysichthon's transgression.

Within Callimachus' vivid description of Demeter's punishment and the repercussions on Erysichthon's family there are four integrative references. The goddess inflicts a strong, burning hunger, a disease, a desire never satisfied, upon the youth (*Hymn* 6.66-80); the poet's use of *αἴθων* probably incorporates into Callimachus' text Hesiod's statement that this was Erysichthon's by-name.[51]

Much more interesting in terms of the impact on the subtext of Callimachus' story is a series of integrative allusions Callimachus makes to Odysseus in his description of Erysichthon's condition. Callimachus' Erysichthon is striken by *λιμὸν / αἴθωνα κρατερόν* ("strong burning hunger"; *Hymn* 6.66-67), and Callimachus later compares trying to fill his *κακὰ ... γαστήρ* ("evil stomach") to filling the depths of the sea, while he wastes away like a wax doll in the sun ("evil belly"; *Hymn* 6.88-93). His resources at an end, Erysichthon's father Triopas calls on his own father Poseidon, calling his son *κακὰ βούβρωστις* ("evil glutton"; *Hymn* 6.102). Finally the king's son must sit at the cross-roads begging for cast off refuse of banquets (*Hymn* 6.114-115). One might say that Demeter's punishment of Erysichthon is to make him become a burning, never-satisfied hunger. All of these passages allude integratively to Odysseus in his guise as Aethon. Levaniouk has connected the adjective used in Callimachus' *Hymn* 6, of Erysichthon's punishment, i.e. *λιμὸν / αἴθωνα* (*Hymn* 6.66-67), to Odysseus' false name and the character he assumes when he arrives on

[51] Hesiod writes: *τὸν δ' Αἴθων' ἐκάλεσσαν ἐπ]ών[υ]μ[ο]ν εἵνεκα λιμοῦ / αἴθωνος κρατεροῦ* ...] ("and they called him Aethon as a nickname because of his great burning hunger;" Fr. 43a 5-6). The first two words of verse 6 are supplemented from Callimachus' text. The chronology makes it difficult, if not impossible to determine, but Callimachus may also be refering to his contemporary Lycophron. Lycophron playfully refers to the etymology of Erysichthon: *τῆς παντομόρφου βασσάρας λαμπουρίδος / τοκῆος, ἥτ' ἀλφαῖσι ταῖς καθ' ἡμέραν / βούπειναν ἀλθαίνεσκεν ἀκμαίαν πατρός / ὀθνεῖα γατομοῦντος Αἴθωνος πτερά* ("the father of the crafty vixen who by daily traffic assuaged the raging hunger of her sire – Aethon, plougher of alien shires"; Lycophron 1393-1396; translation of Mair (1960)). And a scholium on Lycophron 1396: *ὁ δ' Ἐρυσίχθων Αἴθων ἐκαλεῖτο, ὥς φησιν Ἡσίοδος διὰ τὸν λιμόν* (Erysichthon was called Aethon, as Hesiod says, because of his hunger"; vol. 2, 384, Scheer (= Hes. Fr. 43b). McKay (1962a), 104-106, briefly discusses the "duality" of the the adjective and the name "Aethon". See also Hopkinson (1984), 18-22.

Ithaca.[52] As seen in the *Odyssey*, hunger is a stock characteristic of beggars.[53] Odysseus as a wanderer and beggar is perceived by other characters (usually enemies of the king) as driven and motivated primarily by hunger and/or his belly,[54] and by adopting the name "Aethon", Odysseus adopts that persona. Levaniouk argues that Odysseus' name is more than clever word-play. The name represents the state in which the hero finds himself socially—without resources—because the name "Aethon" is also a metaphor for "those who are always dependent on others – always hungry."[55] By alluding integratively to Homer's Aethon Callimachus fills out the character Erysichthon, who through these allusions becomes an object of pity and scorn similar to Odysseus as beggar-in-disguise, and a character whose burning, persistent hunger drives him to leave his own family without resources. And just as Homer exploits the irony of a king who must resort to the guise of a beggar, so does Callimachus when he writes that the kings' son must sit begging at the crossroads (*Hymn* 6.114).

Within this series of integrative allusions, in Triopas' appeal to his father, Poseidon, Callimachus moves to another character and portion of the *Odyssey* and alludes reflectively to the Cyclops' appeal to his own father, Poseidon (*Od.* 9.528-535). Callimachus creates a reference that contrasts with Polyphemus' firm belief in his parentage, who nevertheless gives the god opportunity to verify the relationship (*Od.* 9.529). Triopas' immediate ψευδοπάτωρ ("false father"; *Hymn* 6.98) followed by a conditional (*Hymn* 6.98-100) recalls the Cyclops' very similar phrasing. Echoing Polyphemus's request Triopas asks that one of two things happen to his son, but Callimachus' reflective allusion plays up the irony. Triopas is praying not for the end of his enemy, but

[52] Levaniouk (2000), 26-36 argues that in several contexts αἴθων might be more correctly defined as "fierce", "persistent", "driven", and of animals driven by hunger. More interesting for the Callimachean Erysichthon is "there is a clear relationship between urgent desire and behavior, both bold and crafty, which is aimed at satisfying it. The more acute the frustration, the more intense the 'burning', hence the 'fire-like' intensity of those who cannot be satisfied." (35-36).

[53] See Svenbro (1976) on the relationship of hunger, beggars, and poets. The professional beggar of the *Odyssey*, Iros, is known for his belly (*Od.* 18.1-4).

[54] The *gaster* is a major theme of books 15-20 of the *Odyssey* (though it appears in other books as well), in which Odysseus assumes the disguise of Aethon the beggar. The hero suffers many harsh words from others, e.g., 17.219-22 and 18.363. Odysseus himself complains about the "accursed" belly, e.g., 7.216-217; 15.344-345; 17.226-228. This Homeric theme was later used in comedy. Cf. e.g., Ar. *Nub.* 1292-1295; Plaut. *Curc.* 86.

[55] See Levaniouk (2000), 44.

for the end of his own son. The careful reader will catch the clever parallel Callimachus has created; the Cyclops asks Poseidon to punish Odysseus, who has just violated his home, eaten his food, who has consumed his resources outside the proper form and who was punished by Polyphemus with like action. Odysseus will later become known as Aethon the beggar, resourceless and driven by his belly. Triopas asks Poseidon either to remove his own son's "eating" disease, which has drained the family's wealth, or to feed Erysichthon for him.

Half way through Triopas' appeal to Poseidon, within the reflective allusion to the *Odyssey*, the poet has inserted another reflective lexical allusion to the *Iliad* at 24.532. Triopas' words *κακὰ βούβρωστις* ("evil violent hunger"; *Hymn* 6.102) are a reference to Achilles who tells Priam that this is what Zeus allots the unlucky man. The meaning of *βούβρωστις* is uncertain, but it seems likely that it means "violent hunger".[56] So Achilles states that evil hunger drives the unlucky man over the earth. In quoting the hero Triopas not only evokes the solemn, fated occasion when Achilles and Priam discuss their lots in life and suggests that Erysichthon's punishment was fated, he reveals that according to him his son is not simply stricken by a disease, he has *become* violent hunger.

Conclusion I

McKay and Hopkinson have built a strong case in support of the idea that Callimachus' *Hymns* 5 and 6 are complementary and interrelated.[57] These two hymns exhibit several general correspondences: both possess mimetic frames in which a ritual setting is indirectly delineated by an unknown female speaker, who partakes of the ritual, who serves as a sort of "master of ceremonies" and who narrates a tale;[58] both include a procession of women who follow a cart of sacred object(s) which is pulled by mares; at the center of each hymn is a story that is preceded by a warning; these stories are directed toward the participants or audience and they illustrate the consequences of the breaking of certain taboos; the stories told involve young men who are punished for their deeds and the reactions of their parents are brought to the forefront of the stories; at the end of the stories the speakers

[56] See Hopkinson (1984), 161.
[57] See also Müller (1987), 46-64 who discusses parallels between these two hymns and who attempts to link both hymns to the poet's manifesto of *Aetia* Fr. 1
[58] Concerning the sex of the participants and "the speaker" see Hopkinson (1984), 4.

reintroduce the reader to the mimetic frame, and the hymns end with prayers.[59] These parallels between the two hymns are further emphasized by lexical resemblances.[60] All of these correspondences, however, only serve to emphasize some fundamental contrasts:[61] while the ritual atmosphere of *Hymn* 5 is imbued with the excitement of the beginning of the religious procession, that of *Hymn* 6 is solemn and slow, perhaps representing the end of a long day of fasting in honor of the goddess; the location of the ritual depicted in *Hymn* 5, i.e. most probably at Argos, can be asserted with much more certainty than that of *Hymn* 6; the setting of Tiresias's story is rural, while the setting of Erysichthon's seems focused on a community; the involuntary nature of Tiresias's crime is emphasized, while it is clear that Erysichthon's is quite intentional; the young men of both hymns are pathetic when punished, but Tiresias's end evokes more sympathy; Athena forecasts a very positive future for Tiresias, whereas the reader can not tell what will happen to Erysichthon, though one may guess his end will be bad.

The examination of Callimachus' allusive technique within *Hymn* 6, as well as the previous analysis of *Hymn* 5, supports the proposition that *Hymns* 5 and 6 should be read as a complementary pair. In both poems Callimachus alludes in similar ways and achieves similar effects with these allusions. In the first section of this chapter we observed that in *Hymn* 6, just as in *Hymn* 5, the poet employs generic signatures of the genre of hymn, which may be considered integrative allusions to that genre, and which authenticate the hymn as belonging to the tradition of Greek hymn.

Also in the foregoing chapter we saw how Callimachus uses reflective allusions to a particular *Homeric Hymn* to contrast his choice of story with that of his predecessor. This allusive style in turn undermines the poet's assertion, via allusion, that his hymn belongs to the hymnic tradition. In the *Hymn to Demeter*, Callimachus subverts the validation of his hymn in several ways. Generally speaking, we may say that the mimetic portion of the hymn dislocates the generic identification. The poet first employs two reflective, then two integrative allusions that signal to the reader that this hymn may be more different

[59] See McKay (1962b), 113 and Hopkinson (1984), 13-5 both of whom discuss these parallels in greater detail.

[60] For the specific lexical parallels see Hopkinson (1984), 15-16.

[61] For a different list of contrasts see Hopkinson (1984), 16-17.

than expected. The latter allusions help the poet to insert another, complementary, though different, generic tone into his hymn.

We observed in the discussion of *Hymn* 5 that Callimachus employs reflective allusion to another hymn, which the audience might expect the poet to incorporate into his poem, while he then incorporates into his poem the poetry of another work of a different genre. This particular combination of allusive types in the poem ultimately serves to help the poet stretch the boundaries of what may be considered a "proper" or "traditional" hymn. In contrast to the allusive technique of *Hymn* 5, in *Hymn* 6 Callimachus alludes both integratively and reflectively to one author. While the integrative allusions serve to introduce another genre into the hymn, the reflective allusions then contrast the work of the same author and the same genre—Homer—within the hymn. The result of this mixture of allusive technique is that the unanticipated constantly surfaces as the reader makes his way through the poem and that this uneven texture of the poem emphasizes its artifice.

Ovid's Erysichthon, Homer and Virgil

At this point in the progress of Ovidian scholarship it is far from revolutionary to assert that throughout the *Metamorphoses* Ovid plays with the reader's generic expectations, constantly mixing into individual stories elements from other genres. Though such a statement comes as no surprise, within the context of the clear relationship of Ovid's Erysichthon story with Hesiod's didactic epic as well as with Callimachus' new style of hymn, the poet's references to Homer's and Virgil's epic add yet another dimension to the interplay of genres in this narrative. Once the reader moves out of the rustic, folk-talish story of Philemon and Baucis he may be impressed by the elements of high epic style Ovid inserts into this story.[62] Ovid does not use generic signatures of epic to infuse this story with an epic feeling. Instead he relies upon allusions to the topoi of epic and to particularly memorable epic scenes. However, several of these allusions are not integrative, but reflective; they first evoke an epic atmosphere that they subsequently undermine.[63]

---

[62] Hollis (1970), 132.

[63] As Hollis (1970), 133 points out there are points at which the poet's cleverness are not compatible with the high epic style of this story; e.g. 8.785-786; 8.811-812;

Ovid establishes an epic approach to this story in the first verse with a common epic technique for description, a periphrastic reference to Mestra (*Met.* 8.738). This epic opening is immediately followed by four integrative and reflective references to Virgil's *Aeneid* which incorporate into, and sometimes contrast with, well-known epic characters and situations in Ovid's narrative. Ovid introduces Erysichthon as the father of Mestra (*Met.* 8.738), and then continues to describe the man on two levels. Erysichthon is: *pater huius erat, qui numina divum / sperneret et nullos aris adoleret odores*; ("the father of this [girl, Mestra], who despised the power of the gods and he offered no incense on the altars" ; *Met.* 8.739-740). The poet underlines this man's impiety by describing his outrageous actions quite explicitly, and also by repeating this characterization of him four more times in the text at *Met.* 8.754; 8.761; 8.765-770; 8.792; and 8.817. Erysichthon's character contrasts sharply with the presentation of Philemon and Baucis, whose piety is stressed. From the very beginning of this story the implicit statement seems to be that just as the elderly couple were rewarded for their actions, so too will be Erysichthon.

This delineation of Erysichthon that lies on the surface of the text makes his nature quite evident. By means of an integrative allusion the poet adds another layer to this characterization. These verses also refer to Virgil's character who is mentioned only in conjunction with the words *contemptor divum*, Mezentius (*Aen.* 7.648 and 8.7). The fact that Virgil's Mezentius has a dutiful son, Lausus, whom that poet describes as *dignus patriis qui laetior esset / imperiis*, *et cui pater haud Mezentius esset* ("[Lausus] who was worthy to be happier in the commands of his father, and to have a father who was not Mezentius"; *Aen.* 7.653-654), suggests that this father and son are counterparts to Erysichthon and his dutiful Mestra, *non illo digna parente* ("not worthy of that parent"; *Met.* 8.847).[64] With this integrative allusion the poet sets the tone of his Erysichthon story and simultaneously adds depth to Erysichthon's and Mestra's characters and the nature of their actions.

Having made a connection to Virgil's *Aeneid* the reader may then distinguish another reflective allusion to this poem. The *sceleratus* Erysichthon takes the axe from a servant who hesitates to strike the

---

8.841-842. Hollis continues and contends that the "exaggeration" evidenced in this story may stem from the influence of Accius on the poet; thus it would seem that Hollis suggests that the tone of this story is the result of a conflation epic and tragic styles.

[64] McKay (1962b), 7; Hollis (1970), 134; and Galinsky (1975), 7-8 all of whom comment on this allusion.

sacred tree and declares impiously that even if the tree is not just a tree beloved by the goddess, but houses a nymph, it will fall. While uttering these words Erysichthon holds the weapon poised to strike the tree obliquely and the tree responds by trembling, groaning, and then its leaves and acorns turn white (*Met.* 8.757-758). This scene, particularly the angle of the weapon and the reaction of the target, may remind the reader of Virgil's Laocoon in the *Aeneid* at 2.50-53. Laocoon is a noble man, like Erysichthon, and a holy one; he sees the Trojan Horse for what it is, a threat to the city of Troy, and his striking the Horse is a gesture directed at his fellow Trojans; this wooden horse is no a sacred object, thus he can hit it with impunity. Furthermore, Laocoon may hope that what he believes lurks inside will be revealed by his action. As the reader of the Aeneid knows, Laocoon's words will be disregarded, but Laocoon's action and his word heighten the pathos of the coming fall of the city. Ovid alludes to all of this with his two verses; his Erysichthon is the opposite of Laocoon. He is not a holy man, he does not see the tree for what it truly is, and his action is not to help his community, but to help only himself. However, like Virgil's description of Laocoon's actions, Ovid's portrayal of Erysichthon heightens the man's crime and his punishment.

The poet introduces a simile at *Met.* 8.761-762 (*haud aliter…/ quam;* "hardly otherwise than") in a consciously epic manner, and at *Met.* 8.765 he alludes integratively to Virgil once more by adopting a compositional pattern typical for that poet (*obstipuere omnes*, *aliquisque*…; "everyone stood amazed, and one of them…");[65] both of these devices help to continue the tale's epic tone. Inserted between these verses, at *Met.* 8.763-764, is a reflective allusion to a simile found in the epics of both Homer and Virgil. In the *Iliad* at 20.403-405, the bellowing of Hippodamas struck by Achilles is compared to that of a bull as it is dragged to be sacrificed to Poseidon. Virgil himself alludes to this simile reflectively in the *Aeneid* at 2.223-224, when he likens Laocoon, as he is sacrificing to Poseidon, to the bellowing of a bull under the sacrificial axe. This poet's allusion to the Homeric simile produces a pathetic and ironic tone; the sacrificing priest himself is compared to a sacrificial victim, as indeed Laocoon is for his city. Ovid's comparison, which likens the bleeding of the tree to the bleed-

[65] A manner that could be compared to *non aliter quam* … at *Aen.* 4.669; the Virgilian pattern is "-ēre + (e.g.) omnes + que," see Hollis (1970), 136-137 who sites e.g. *Aen.* 2.1 *conticuere omnes, intentique ora tenebant* as an example of this formula

ing of the sacrificial bull, is a considerable alteration that stresses the impropriety of Erysichthon's action. Erysichthon's striking the tree is not a sacrifice or gift for the goddess, but is, in fact, a sacrilege.[66]

Ovid broadens his reflective allusion at *Met.* 8.775-776, in which he describes the felling of the great oak, transforming a standard epic simile and including it as part of his "epic" narrative.[67] This simile is used traditionally in epics to dramatically describe the death of a man or even the fall of a city. Ovid refers to this usage in epic, thereby inserting epic tone into the narrative, but alters the simile so that it no longer stands outside the narrative, but becomes part of the narrative. The attack and the death of the tree, and the nymph who lives in it, is described as the felling of a tree.

Ovid opens his next reflective allusion to the tradition of personification (*Met.* 8.785-822) by first alluding integratively to the epic device of ecphrasis: *est locus.../...illic* ("there is a place.....there"; *Met.* 8.788-790).[68] Hollis suggests that Ovid in this scene may be alluding to Δεῖμός τε Φόβος τε of Homer (*Il.* 11.37). Because there seems little relation between Homer's brief reference to two emotions, which are depicted on a shield, and Ovid's very graphic depiction of Hunger, it is more likely that subsequent, more detailed personifications grew out of the Homeric Δεῖμός τε Φόβος τε. Instead Ovid may be alluding reflectively to the Homeric scene of Hera persuading Hypnos to "infect" Zeus (*Il.* 14.225ff.). While Homer does not describe Hypnos' appearance and says little about his abode, Ovid may have transformed and elaborated upon the interaction of the goddess and Sleep. Hesiod's *Theogony*, verses 211-230, may have provided Ovid with Hunger's genealogy, but like the Homeric personifications of Fear and Terror, this passage was probably the inspiration for more detailed personifications. Euripides develops the notion of personification in literature

---

[66] As Anderson (1972), 405 points out.

[67] Hollis (1970), 137 spotted the standard epic simile; e.g., *Il.* 4. 482 where the death of a man is compared to the felling of a black poplar; *Il.* 13.389 the death of a man is compared to the felling of an oak, white poplar, or pine tree which carpenters cut for shipmaking; *Argo.* 4.1682 the felling and death of Talos is particularly picturesque; in the *Aen.* 2.626 Virgil breathes new life into the simile by comparing the fall of Troy to the felling of a giant tree.

[68] See Hollis (1970), 138-139. Hollis suggests that Ovid's *Frigus...Pallorque Tremorque* may be drawn from Homer's Δεῖμος τε Φόβος τε (which appears to be a 7th century BC addition to the Homeric text) (*Il.* 11.37), though "strictly speaking the latter are war-spirits, represented in Ovid by *Pavor* and *Terror*" (4.485); the spirits on the "Hesiodic" *Shield of Heracles* (154f.) seem to be based on those on Agamemnon's shield (*Il.* 11.37, above).

further with his portrayal of Madness in the *Heracles*; this too may have inspired Ovid. Perhaps more closely related to the Roman poet's personification of Hunger would have been his own culture's habit of deifying personifications, such as Fides, Virtus, and Concordia.[69] Ovid seems to be alluding integratively to Virgil's depiction of Allecto (*Aen.* 7.323), which in turn might have been based on Hesiod's Eris or Ennius' Discordia.[70] Though a Fury, Allecto's infection of Amata and Turnus exhibits general similarities with Hunger's infection of Erysichthon, but in no extant text do we find a personification that is so well-developed as Ovid's Hunger.[71]

Within the personification of Hunger, the poet alludes reflectively to his literary predecessors with the effect that this personification is further distinguished from those of others. Homer's and Virgil's Hera, for example, travels to the homes of Sleep and Allecto to make their requests personally. Somewhat humorously Ovid makes reference to these scenes with his explanation of how such opposites as Demeter and Hunger could work together: *quae quatinus ipsi / non adeunda deae est* (*neque enim Cereremque Famemque / fata coire sinunt*), *montani numinis unam / talibus agrestem conpellat oreada dictis*…("seeing that she could not approach the goddess herself (since fate does not allow Ceres and Hunger to meet), she gave orders to a rustic oread, one of the mountain spirits…"; *Met.* 8.784-787). Ovid begins his personification with an integrative allusion to a typical compositional technique of epic, which evokes an epic atmosphere. The following reflective allusions to personifications then signal that this text breaks with this epic tradition.

As Ovid draws to the end of the Erysichthon portion of this tale, before he moves on to Mestra, he alludes once more reflectively and then integratively to the epic tradition. At *Met.* 8.835-842 the reader encounters a double simile that alludes reflectively to the double or triple similes of Homer, who combines descriptions of forces from the natural world, such as fire and water, to vividly illustrate war.[72] Other poets allude to this Homeric practice, each trying to combine elements and descriptions in different and more sophisticated ways. Ovid's allu-

[69] Hollis (1970), 141.

[70] Williams (1972), 191-192.

[71] Of course, the personification of Hunger here reminds the reader of Invidia at 2.760ff.; of Somnus at 11.592ff; and of Fama and 12.39ff.

[72] E.g., *Il.* 11.155ff.; *Il.* 14.394ff.; *Il.* 20.490ff.; *Geo.* 4.261ff.; *Aen.* 12.521ff.; Cat. 68.119ff.; *Met.* 11.24ff.

sion to the Homeric, or epic, double simile once more imparts an epic tone into the tale. But if the reader recalls that Homer's similes are used in the context of war, whereas Ovid employs these similes to describe Erysichthon's hunger, this epic mode is undermined. Then at *Met.* 8.845, in an apparent about-face the poet uses a Virgilian formation, *implacatae*, which is used most memorably to describe Charybdis in the *Aeneid* 3.420, to portray Erysichthon.[73] This particular adjective should strike the reader as exceptional and should recall its epic context. The allusion injects epic tone, but also humor since it equates Erysichthon with a monster of the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*. Ovid concludes the Erysichthon story by continuing to allude integratively to the epic tradition by adopting elevated, "epic" language at *Met.* 8.855-68,[74] which once more produces humor because of the juxtaposition of the register of the language used by the characters in the situation.

One effect of Ovid's integrative and reflective allusions to epic compositional techniques and to notable epic scenes found in Homer and Virgil is that the tone of this narrative appears uneven; the high epic tone is sometimes confirmed or subverted by Ovid's allusions. The result is that it might seem that the poet has written an epic version of the Erysichthon tale that he subsequently undermines. Instead, as the following section will corroborate, just as Callimachus places the Erysichthon story within a mimetic frame, Ovid situates an essentially non-heroic story within an epic frame. The consequence of Ovid's allusive techniques is that his poetic ploys become evident.

Ovid's Reflective Allusions to Callimachus

As we have observed earlier, Ovid often draws upon more than one source for a particular tale he recounts, and he is just as liable to combine two very different or related tales to create a narrative that is particularly his own. It seems probable that for the Mestra portion of the Erysichthon tale the poet relied upon Hesiod's *Catalogue*, while for the Erysichthon component Callimachus' version in *Hymn* 6 was Ovid's inspiration.[75] Given what we know about Ovid's referential habits in

[73] See Hollis (1970), 144 and Anderson (1972), 411.
[74] Hollis (1970), 144-6 and Anderson (1972), 413-41.
[75] Hesiod Fr. 43a. Hollis (1970), 128-9, and Hopkinson (1984), 23 agree that Ovid relied upon both Hesiod and Callimachus, though McKay (1962a), 44 thinks there is "no chance" that Ovid relied upon Hesiod. Aside from a reference to Erysichthon's

relation to Callimachus' poetry it is not surprising that his allusions most often serve to reflect or distinguish his own creation from that of his predecessor's.

Very early in his Erysichthon tale Ovid places a signpost that the subsequent verses are allusive.[76] The reader discovers at *Met.* 8.741-742 that Erysichthon is a man who scorns the gods, so much so that he violated a sacred grove: *ille etiam Cereale nemus violasse securi / dicitur et lucos ferro temerasse vetustos* ("it is said that that man violated the grove of Ceres with an axe and he dishonored the sacred wood with iron"; *Met.* 8.741-742). *Dicitur* functions here as a general appeal to tradition as well as a signal of an allusion This particular signpost most likely points the reader's attention to Callimachus' rendition of the tale of Erysichthon, especially given that only Callimachus' and Ovid's poems make mention of the felling of a sacred tree. The verse immediately following, *Met.* 8.743, is a reflective allusion to two very different contexts and poets, Virgil and Callimachus. Ovid's *annoso robore quercus* ("the oak with its long-lived strength") clearly alludes reflectively to Virgil's simile in at *Aeneid* 4.441, *annoso…robore quercum*. Here Aeneas' resolve to leave Dido and Carthage is compared to a stout oak tree which even the north winds cannot uproot. Virgil's simile is itself a reflective allusion to the Homeric simile in which Patroclus' resolve in battle is compared to an oak tree buffeted by the winds (*Il.* 12.131ff.);[77] thus Virgil transforms a Homeric simile used in the context of warfare, to the context of a love affair. Ovid's allusion to Virgil's, and perhaps to Homer's, simile imports into his own text the general tone of epic and underlines the strength of the tree. Notice, however, that Ovid's oak does not exist within a simile, but within the narrative itself. The poet has transformed the simile considerably. On another level Ovid's oak tree is also a reflective allusion to Callimachus poplar tree (*Hymn* 6.37). The reader should probably not get carried away by the fact that the authors employ different species of trees, but should focus on *Met.* 8.746 of Ovid's tale, *saepe sub hac dryades festas duxere choreas* ("the dryads

---

nickname, which will be discussed below and which might be an allusion to Hesiod, or perhaps to Lycophron or even Nicander, there are no lexical links between Ovid's story and the fragments of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, though it seems very likely that Ovid relied upon this passage for the general outline of the Mestra portion.

[76] Ross (1975), 78 identifies this as an Alexandrian footnote, and Hinds (1998), 1-16 expands the terminology and the relationship of texts.

[77] Williams (1972), 373.

often led their dances under this tree"), which a clear reflective allusion to Callimachus *Hymn* 6.38: *τῷ δ' ἔπι ταὶ νύμφαι ποτὶ τὤνδιον ἑψιόωντο* ("around which the nymphs used to play at noon"). Ovid's specification of the nymphs and their activites around the tree emphasize the religiousity of the tree and Erysichthon's violation of the grove.

Ovid's *Met.* 8.765-769 allude reflectively to a similar scene in Callimachus' Erysichthon tale. At *Hymn* 6.46-53 Callimachus' Demeter, disguised as her priestess Nicippe, kindly asks Erysichthon to cease from cutting down the sacred trees, but the young man looks at her more fiercely than a lioness protecting her newborn cubs looks at a hunter, and tells her to give way, lest he fix his axe in her flesh. Ovid alters and develops this scene further by writing that a servant of his Erysichthon tries to stop him from desecrating the woods. The Ovidian Erysichthon then puts into action what Callimachus' Erysichthon only threatened; without warning, he decapitates the servant, telling him *mentis…piae cape praemia* ("take this as the reward for your pious feelings"; *Met.* 8.767).

Though Ovid was unable to duplicate in Latin the Hesiodic nickname of Erysichthon alluded to by Callimachus, the poet does integrate into his narrative a description of the man's sickness, *ardor edendi* ("desire of eating"; *Met.* 8.828) which is an allusion to Callimachus *λιμὸν / αἴθωνα* ("desire of eating"; *Hymn* 6.66-67); Ovid's choice of words for the description of the disease that afflicts the man repeats the metaphor of a burning desire to eat and might refer indirectly to Erysichthon's by-name as well..

As discussed earlier, in his use of a double simile Ovid alludes to a common epic practice and imports an epic tone into his own narrative. If we examine Ovid's double simile more carefully, however, we see that the poet alludes reflectively to Callimachus' double simile. Callimachus employs his double simile to depict the nature of Erysichthon's hunger, while Ovid uses his double simile for the same purpose. Yet Ovid approaches the Callimachean simile more closely in the first portion of his simile, the *fretum* that can absorb waters from rivers around the world, (*Met.* 8.835-836), is a reflective allusion to the first part of Callimachus' own double simile, which also vividly describes the capabilities of the boy's stomach; everything edible is poured into his stomach as into the depths of the sea (*Hymn* 6.88-90). Ovid not only lengthens this part of the simile to two verses, he expands upon the quality of endlessness of Callimachus' simile by conjuring up all the rivers around the world (*de tota flumina terra*; "the

rivers around the world (*de tota flumina terra*; "the rivers of all the world"; *Met.* 8.835) pouring into the *fretum*, a word which carries with it connotations of a raging or swelling.[78] The second portion of the double simile Ovid departs from Callimachus' imagery of a wax doll melting in the sun, but here alludes integratively to the man's nickname, Aethon. It is standard practice for a poet to contrast elements in double or triple similes, and so in describing the young man's hunger Callimachus first compares the flow of food into Erysichthon's belly to water pouring into the depths of the sea, and then compares the wasting away of the his body to a wax doll melting in the sun. Ovid first employs water, comparing Erysichthon's bottomless belly to the bottomless sea that absorbs all the waters from all the rivers. Then, departing from the Callimachean images of a body melting away, Ovid shifts to the element of fire, describing Erysichthon's hunger to flames that once fed become hungrier. This surely is not only a reflective allusion to the second portion of Callimachus' double allusion, but is also a reflective allusion to Erysichthon's Greek by-name, Aethon, which as we have discovered means a *burning* hunger.

Finally, before turning to the character of Mestra, Ovid alludes reflectively within the Erysichthon portion of his narrative. The poet's description of the man's insatiable hunger at *Met.* 8.843-844, *iamque fame patrias altique voragine ventris / attenuarat opes* ("by this time because of his hunger and the pit of his deep stomach he had reduced his family fortunes…"), lexically refers to and expands upon the Callimachean *Hymn* 6.113: *ἀλλ' ὅκα τὸν βαθὺν οἶκον ἀνεξήραναν ὀδόντες* ("but when his teeth had consumed his rich house"). Ovid ends Erysichthon's part of the tale with another image of the stomach that has consumed inherited wealth in contrast to the teeth of Callimachus' Erysichthon which have consumed the "deep", or rich, house of Erysichthon's parents.

This collection of reflective allusions within Ovid's already distinctive Erysichthon narrative serves first to recall Callimachus' portrayal of a youthful, hubristic Erysichthon, and then to contrast this character and story as a whole with Callimachus characterization of the man and telling of the story. Generally speaking one may say Ovid's reflective allusions to Callimachus' characterization of Erysichthon emphasize how the former portrays his older Erysichthon as more violent and more brutal.

[78] See the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

Conclusion II

In his *Hymn to Demeter* Callimachus' use of generic signatures, i.e. his integrative allusions to the genre "hymn", serve to draw the poem closer to the chosen compositional form, while the mimetic frame undermines this. The integrative and reflective references of the first portion of the poem signal the reader that this may not be a traditional hymn, and the integrative and reflective allusions to Homer, that draw the reader closer to, then farther away from, epic create a very uneven tone. In short it seems that most of the allusions in *Hymn* 6 function as devices to help Callimachus in pushing the boundaries of the genre of hymn. Furthermore, as we have seen the poet's allusive techniques of *Hymn* 6 also support the notion that this hymn should be read as a complement to *Hymn* 5.

Just as Callimachus uses both integrative and reflective allusion to destabilize or "question" the boundaries of one genre, we have observed that Ovid too plays with the reader's generic expectations with his references.[79] His reflective allusions to one of his primary sources helps him differentiate the form and content of his Erysichthon tale, and his "epicizing" a non-heroic tale, by means of reflective and integrative allusions to Homer and Virgil, parallels Callimachus' problematization of the boundaries of his chosen genre. The impression this body of allusions creates is one of variable tone. To act as a ballast the poet uses Callimachus' poetry as a model for a significant part of Book 8.

Only a portion of Book 8 has been examined in this chapter, but the theme that unifies this narrative with others of this book (*Met.* 8.260-884) is Callimachus' poetry. In the second two-thirds of Book 8 Ovid refers time and again to Callimachus' *Hecale*, *Hymn* 4 and *Hymn* 6.[80] The "Hecalean" influence of the rustic entertainment of Theseus by the pious Philemon and Baucis (8.620-724) are well-known and well-

[79] Galinsky (1975), 1-14 states that (especially when comparing the treatments of Erysichthon) Ovid's poetic style in the *Metamorphoses* is "more varied, uneven, and even inconsistent" than Callimachus' (6). Based on the present examination and those of previous chapters, I would disagree; Callimachus' poetry displays a similar love of variety, unevenness, and inconsistency.

[80] Crabbe (1981), 2289 and Diagram I, first gathered together some of these "reminiscences" in her discussion of the organization of *Metamorphoses* 8.

documented, as is Ovid's debt to Callimachus' *Hymn* 6 in his rendition of the Erysichthon story (*Met.* 8.738-878), which has been examined here from the perspective of allusion but elsewhere from different viewpoints.[81] Notice, however, that Ovid contrasts the pious couple with the impious Erysichthon while drawing inspiration (and alluding to that inspiration) from two different poems of Callimachus and combining them. Ovid's story of the transformation of Perimele into an island in a river (*Met.* 8.590-610) reflectively alludes to Asteria of Callimachus' *Hymn* 4, as does Ovid's negatively tinged treatment of Echinades (*Met.* 8.577-589), which is one of the first islands to flee Leto in that hymn. The story of Theseus' journey *from* Calydon and shelter in a cave (*Met.* 8.547-559), where he is entertained by stories alludes to Callimachus' Theseus' journey *to* the Bull of Marathon, his shelter in the cottage of Hecale and her entertainment of him with stories. Within this frame, then, Ovid places (with the exception of Proteus) an assortment of stories that are derived from Callimachus, but which Ovid distinguishes as his own by means of reflective allusions to his predecessor.

[81] Hollis (1990), 107.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

The impetus for this book was the desire to objectify from one perspective the "Callimachean" nature of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and, more generally, Callimachus' "Callimacheanism". The vehicle, an examination of each poet's allusive technique, was selected primarily because of the intertextual relationship allusion reveals; any poet's mode of allusion communicates to the reader a great deal about his poetry's relationship to that of others. The Contean typology of allusion—the integrative and reflective allusive types—was chosen as the device with which Callimachus' and Ovid's allusions were examined because of its relative simplicity and its focus on the interaction of texts, instead of a particular poet's supposed intentions. The study has revealed, however, that Conte's typology can be further refined to include various ways in which allusive passages are signposted as allusive, and it may be expanded to include allusive devices, which authenticate entire poems or portions of poems as belonging to a particular poetic tradition.

In terms of allusion, if we define "Callimachean" poetry as poetry based on several different sources that nonetheless constantly strives, often in a quite self-conscious manner, to distinguish itself from its predecessors, then Ovid's allusive style within the portions of his epic examined in this study is "Callimachean". Both Callimachus and Ovid draw from diverse sources, though the Hellenistic poet draws from and alludes to many quite different sources, weaving together many different but somehow related tales and alluding to these and non-associated sources. Ovid's allusive tendency is to draw from and allude to different versions of one story. Neither poet alludes integratively often, though Callimachus uses this mode of allusion to draw from poetry quite different from his own in order to create texts filled with the unexpected, possessing a very "uneven" texture, and quite distinct from any other. Ovid relies upon reflective allusion for the same purpose and differs from Callimachus in his reliance upon his poetic abilities to expand, contract, and vary details of traditional stories, in contrast to

Callimachus' habit of weaving together disparate tales, to create his distinctive poetry.

The second chapter of this study begins the investigation of the allusive techniques of Callimachus and Ovid by focusing narrowly on the programmatic terminology in the prologues of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Aetia.* The vocabulary employed here constitutes lexical allusions signifying the *quid* and, just as importantly, the *quale* of the poems. These allusions also convey important clues to the author's poetic technique and his approach to the poems in general, and suggest the predominant types of allusion the reader may find throughout the two poems.

This study examines the adjectives διηνεκές and λεπταλέην (and λεπτός by implication) and reveals that Callimachus' use of the former is an integrative allusion to Homer that suggests that in the *Aetia* he follows Homeric compositional practices. The poet's use of the latter consitutes an integrative allusion to Homer, as well as to the poetry of Euripides and Aristophanes, which in turn embues the adjective with yet another connotation.. The "Homeric" notion of a story told with all the details, διηνεκές, is what Callimachus wishes to avoid, and with his use of λεπταλέην the poet suggests to the reader that Apollo urged him to produce a slender poem, a subtle and sophisticated poem, an overly sophisticated poem, and a finely-spun poem. The generic implications of these two lexical allusions have a considerable impact upon the reader's understanding of the *Aetia.* Because both terms evoke other genres, they would appear to emphasize the importance of poetic style, not poetic genre, for this poem.

The examination of Ovid's programmatic phrase, *perpetuum deducite carmen* reveals that few Latin poets use either *perpetuum carmen* or *deductum carmen* in their poetry, and that even fewer use these phrases in contexts of programmatic importance. Still it seems that by Ovid's day these terms were common and denoted a "Callimachean" poetic aesthetic. The fact that Ovid places them side by side in his proem is significant. More specifically, it seems that the poet's use of *perpetuum carmen* is a reflective allusion to Horace's and Callimachus' poetry, in which Ovid has redeployed the term to indicate temporal continuity. Ovid's *deducite carmen* recalls a *deductum carmen*, a finely-spun poem, and is an allusion to Virgil and Callimachus. With this allusion too it seems that Ovid redefines these terms in his placement of *deducite* between *perpetuum* and *carmen.*

This syntactically states that his poem with be both "Callimachean" and "un-Callimachean" and implicitly suggests that he wishes to create a new defintion for "Callimacheanism".

Because this chapter concentrates on lexical allusions made via programmatic terminology of the *Aetia* prologue and the proem of the *Metamorphoses*, we can make a few general assumptions about each poet's approach to writing in these poems. The fact that Callimachus uses an integrative allusion in the prologue of his *Aetia* is at least partially indicative of his poetic technique for this poem as a whole. He would seem to suggest from the outset that though his poem is of a different sort, he will integrate pieces of his poetic heritage into this creation. Ovid's reflective allusions indicate that he will more openly reflect upon poetic predecessors in his poem, but that the reader should expect ambiguities and contradictions as he weaves them all into his creation.

The third chapter of the book concentrates on a broader approach to Ovid's and Callimachus' allusive techniques. Here multiple lexical allusions within individual traditional tales are examined as is a signposting technique employed by both poets to signal particularly allusive passages in their work. The analyses of this chapter also serve to expand the definition of allusion to embrace the referential manner in which poets may manipulate traditional stories.

More specifically this chapter demonstrates that in his Actaeon tale Ovid alludes both integratively and reflectively to Callimachus' portrayal of Actaeon and Tiresias respectively. The integrative allusions to Callimachus' characterization and treatment of Actaeon serve to authenticate Ovid's own version of the same tale. At the same time his reflective references to Callimachus' Tiresias both reveal his awareness of his predecessor's treatment of Tiresias and Actaeon, separately and as parallel tales, and serve to heighten the pathos of Ovid's version of Actaeon's demise.

In contrast to Ovid, Callimachus does not allude integratively to the sources of these particular myths, but to poetry that lies outside this domain. He does so in such a way that his *Hymn* 5 is authenticated as belonging to the Greek hymnic tradition. The reflective nature of Callimachus' allusions to his source material ultimately underscore his innovative treatment of the characters portrayed in the hymn particularly the hymn's object, Athena.

This chapter also explores both poets' use of an internal or integrated signpost technique that aids the reader in identifying allusive portions of their texts. It is evidenced that Ovid, who demarcates his poem with external as well as internal marking, is especially adept at calling the reader's attention to his references. Finally, the analysis of this chapter continues to extend our understanding of allusion. We have seen that in the manipulation of tales both poets, particularly Callimachus, allude reflectively to generic traditions and to the reader's generic expectations. These more broad and general reflective allusions invite the reader to compare aspects of Callimachus' and Ovid's compositions, such as framework and arrangement, with more traditional poems of the same genre. The result is that the reader is encouraged to question the properties of a given genre.

The scope of the fourth chapter is broader still in the quantity of texts examined, and it continues to push the boundaries of the definition of allusion. This chapter focuses on stories within substantial portions of Callimachus' *Hymn* 4 and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Book 6 in which neither confines himself to lexical allusions and in which both freely alternate allusive types in a series of connected tales. Previously unexamined, but in some ways comparable to the signpost technique discussed in Chapter 3 is the technique of authorization whereby the poets employ characters within their narratives to validate poetic license and to point up the reflective nature of the poetry. We see that in his *Hymn* 4 Callimachus alludes in a very systematic manner that simultaneously verifies and distinguishes his poem from the hymnic genre. At first glance Ovid's mode of allusion seems less orderly, more organic; however, a pattern lies underneath.

In his *Hymn to Delos* Callimachus alludes integratively to the genre "hymn" by incorporating generic signatures of the hymnic form into his own poem. This allusive technique validates Callimachus' poem as a hymn and as a text belonging to the hymnic tradition. Callimachus then alludes reflectively, both lexically and non-lexically, to two primary sources, which serves to differentiate his own version of the mythical stories from that of his predecessors. However, Callimachus takes some of these reflective allusions one step further than previously examined by placing them within the mouths of credible characters. This technique authorizes the poet's deviations from the original stories, it points up the presence of reflective allusions, and it underscores the self-conscious nature of Callimachus compositional style. Further-

more, one effect of the mixture of integrative and reflective allusions is that Callimachus' hymn seems to be concurrently asserting the right to be categorized as a hymn, contrasting itself with this genre, and attempting to stretch the definition of the genre.

A close examination of the Ovidian tales that parallel Callimachus' stories in his *Hymn* 4 revealed that Ovid twice employed a signposting technique in a manner very similar to his Hellenistic predecessor: Ovid places tales within the mouths of characters who are so credible that the poet's alteration of the traditional tale is verified. However, Ovid uses the signposts in such an obvious matter that he undermines his own authentication. The final effect is that the reflective allusions that follow each signpost are pointed out as is the poet's general artifice. Also examined were Ovid's several alternating integrative and reflective allusions to various authors. These shifting allusions serve, just as they do in Callimachus, to authorize his tales as belonging to the tradition, to differentiate his tales from the tradition, but ultimately to point out the mechanics of his own compositional style. Furthermore, the poet's free mixture of genre—elements of tragedy, hymn, rhetoric, and aitological myth—is singly and jointly an allusion to each genre, which suggests that this poet felt few genric boundaries.

The final chapter focuses on an aspect of allusion that each proceeding chapter touches upon, the relationship of allusion and genre. More specifically this chapter examines how, within the context of the retelling of one story, both poets bring the weight of an arsenal of allusive types to bear upon their poetry in such a way that their tales are simultaneously authenticated, then differentiated, from the poetry of others and the notion of generic classification is questioned. Callimachus and Ovid use alternating reflective and integrative allusions to recall and inject into their poetry various genres. This in turn contrasts with the apparent genres of their own poems and incorporates the textures of other genres into their poems. The result is that the tone of each narrative constantly shifts and the reader is never confronted with "the expected" for long. Another ramification of this system of allusion is that the process of poetic creation is unmasked. This allusive technique is one that suggests the destabilization of the boundaries of poetic genre, and ultimately one that calls attention to the mechanics of poetic composition.

For example, within his *Hymn to Demeter* Callimachus inserts several generic signatures of "the hymn" and then places it within a setting

appropriate for a hymn, i.e. a mimetic frame. However, it is the mimetic frame itself that undermines the poet's own attempt at authorization. Then leading into the narrative of the hymn the poet prepares the reader for an unanticipated story by using a combination of reflective and integrative allusions that also serve to introduce the notion of another genre into the hymn. In the narrative proper Callimachus portrays Erysichthon to a great extent via allusions, once more both reflective and integrative, to still another genre.

Ovid too seems to be examining the issue of genre via allusion within his own version of Erysichthon's story. Here the poet alludes integratively and reflectively to two epic poets, and in doing so, like Callimachus, introduces another genre into his poem and alternatively reflects this introduction with his own treatment. The effect of this technique of allusion is a narrative of uneven tone and a narrative that encourages the reader to see the poet as toying with generic boundaries. Ovid's reflective allusions in his characterization of Erysichthon to Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter* serve to distinguish his treatment, but ultimately it is the poet's references to Callimachus that run throughout a large portion of *Metamorphoses* 8 that in fact unify it and draw it closer to Callimachus' poetry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography of Editions Consulted

Allen, T.W., Halliday, W.R., and Sikes, E.E., eds. (1936, second ed.), *The Homeric Hymns*. Oxford.

Anderson, W.S., ed. (1993), *Ovidius Metamorphoses*. Leipzig.

Butler, H.E., ed. and trans. (1962), *Propertius*. London and New York.

Butler, H.E. and Barber, E.A., eds. (1933), *The Elegies of Propertius*. Hildesheim.

Campbell, D.A., ed. (1967), *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. New York.

Coleman, R., ed. (1977), *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge.

Diggle, J., ed. (1984), *Euripidis Fabulae, Tomus I*. Oxford.

Frazer, J.G., ed. (1956 and 1961, repr.), *Apollodorus: The Library vol. 1-2*. London and New York.

Goold, G.P., ed. (1977), *Ovid: Heroides and Amores*. Cambridge, MA and London.

——, ed. (1977), *Manilius: Astronomica*. Cambridge, MA and London.

——, ed. (1990), *Propertius: Elegies*. Cambridge, MA and London.

Hall, F.W. and Geldart, W.M., eds. (1907, second ed.), *Aristophanis Comoediae*. *Tomus I et II*. Oxford.

Hall, J.B., ed. (1995), *P.Ovidi Nasonis. Tristia*. Stuttgart.

Jacoby, F., ed. (1940-1958), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. 12 vols. Leiden.

Lightfoot, J.L., ed. (1999), *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα, Edited with Introduction and Commentaries*. Oxford.

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P.J., eds. (1983), *Supplementum Hellenisticum (Texte und Kommentare I)*. Berlin.

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N.G., eds. (1990), *Sophoclis Fabulae*. Oxford.

Maehler, H., ed. (1989), *Pindarus Fragmenta, Pars II*. Leipzig.

——, and Snell, B., eds. (1980 and 1975), *Pindarus Pars I. Epinicia.* Leipzig.

Nauck, A., ed. (1889, second ed.), *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta*. Leipzig.

Olson, S.D., ed. (2002), *Aristophanes Acharnians*. Oxford.

Page, D.L., ed. (1972), *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias.* Oxford.

Papathomopoulos, M., ed. (1968), *Antoninus Liberalis. Les Métamorphoses*. Paris.

Pfeiffer, R., ed. (1949-1953), *Callimachus I - II.* Oxford.

Quinn, K., ed. (1973), *Catullus: The Poems*. London and Basingstoke.

Rudd, N., ed. (1989), *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistles to the Pisones ("Ars Poetica")*. Cambridge.

Rutherford, I., ed. (2001), *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.

Shakleton Bailey, D.R., ed. (1985), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Stuttgart.

Snell, B. and Maehler, H., eds. (1970), *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis*. Leipzig.

Solmsen, F., Merkelbach, R., and West, M.L., ed. (1990), *Hesiod Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum, Fragmenta Selecta.* Oxford.

Stanford, W.B., ed. (1947), *The Odyssey of Homer. 2 Vols*. London.

Vian, F. and Delage, E., eds. (1974), *Apollonios de Rhodes. Argonautiques*. Tome 1-3. Paris.
West, M.L., ed. (1970), *Hesiod: Works and Days.* Oxford.
——, ed. (1993), *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Oxford.
——, ed. (1998, second ed.), *Iambi et Elegi Graeci: Ante Alexandrum Cantati*. Oxford.
——, ed. (1998-2000), *Homeri Ilias.* 2 vols. Stuttgart.
Williams, R.D., ed. (1972), *The Aeneid of Virgil*. London.
Winterbottom, M., ed. and trans. (1974), *The Elder Seneca. Declamations in Two Volumes*. Cambridge, MA and London.

General Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002), *Polyeideia: "The Iambi" of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley.
Adam, L. (1889), *Die Aristotelische Theorie vom Epos nach ihrer Entwicklung bei Griechen und Römern*. Wiesbaden.
Albrecht, M. von, (2003), *Ovid. Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart.
Allen, T.W. (1934), "Theognis." *PBA* 20: 71-89.
Andersen, O. (1987), "Myth, Paradigm and 'Spatial Form' in the *Iliad*", in Bremer, de Jong, and Kalff, eds.: 1-13.
Anderson, W.S. (1972), *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 6-10.* Norman, Oklahoma.
Andrews, N.E. (1998), "Philosophical Satire in the *Aetia* Prologue", in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., Wakker, G.C., eds.: 1-19.
Arkins, B. (1988), "The Freedom of Influence: Callimachus and Latin Poetry." *Latomus* 48: 285-293.
Axelson, B. (1945), *Unpoetische Wörter: ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Lund.
Barchiesi, A. (1984), *La traccia del modello: effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana*. Pisa.
—— (1994), "Immovable Delos: *Aeneid* 3.73-98 and the Hymns of Callimachus." *CQ* 44: 438-443.
Beck, D. (1998-1999), "Speech Introductions and the Character Development of Telemachus." *CJ* 94.2: 121-141.
Benediktson, D.T. (1977), "Vocabulary Analysis and the Generic Classification of Literature." *Phoenix* 30: 341-348.
Bergren, A. (1983), "Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought." *Arethusa* 16: 69-95.
Berkowitz, L.B., Squitier, K.A., Johnson, W.A. eds. (1990), *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Oxford.
Beye, C.R. (1982), *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Carbondale.
Bing, P. (1988), *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (*Hypomnemata* 90). Göttingen.
—— (1996), "Callimachus and the *Hymn to Demeter.*" *Syllecta Classica* 6: 29-42.
Binns, J.W., ed. (1973), *Ovid.* London and Boston.
Blome, P. (1977), "Begram und Rom. Zu den Vorbildern des Aktaionsarkophages im Louvre." *AK* 20: 43-53.
Bloom, H. (1973), *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford.

Boedeker, D. and Sider, D., eds. (2001), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford.

Bömer, F. (1957-1958), *P. Ovidius Naso. Die Fasten*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.

Bömer, F. (1969-1986), *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen*. 7 vols. Heidelberg.

Bornmann, F. (1968), *Callimachus, Hymnus in Dianam*. Firenze.

Boyd, B.W. (1997), *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the "Amores"*. Ann Arbor.

Boyd, B.M., ed. (2002), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden.

Bremer, J.M., de Jong, I.J.F., and Kalff, J., eds. (1987), *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry: Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation*. Amsterdam.

Brink, C.O. (1971), *Horace on Poetry. The "Ars Poetica."* Cambridge.

Brouwers, J.H. (1985), "Propertius' *El.* 3,4: triomflied en *recusatio*-gedicht." *Lampas* 18: 203-213.

Buitron-Oliver, D. and Cohen, B. (1995), "Between Skylla and Penelope: Female Characters of the *Odyssey* in Archaic and Classical Greek Art". In Cohen, B., ed.: 29-60.

Bulloch, A.W. (1977), "Callimachus Erysichthon, Homer and Apollonius Rhodius." *AJPh* 98: 97-123.

—— (1984), "The Future of a Hellenistic Illusion: Some Observations on Callimachus and Religion." *MH* 41: 209-230.

—— (1985), *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge.

—— (1989), "Callimachus", in Easterling, P.E. and Knox, B.M.W., eds. : 9-30.

Burkert, W. (1987), "Offerings in Perspective: Surrender, Distribution, Exchange", in Linders and Nordquist: 43-50.

Buxton, R.G.A. (1980), "Blindness and Limits: Sophokles and the Logic of Myth." *JHS* 100 : 22-37.

Cahen, E. (1929), *Callimaque et son oeuvre poétique*. Paris.

—— (1930), *Les Hymnes de Callimaque, Commentaire explicatif et critique*. Paris.

Cairns, F. (1979), *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge.

Cameron, A. (1995), *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.

Campbell, M. (1981), *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden.

Camps, W.A., ed. (1967), *Propertius: Elegies Book III*. Cambridge.

Castiglioni, L. (1906), *Studio intorno alle fonti e alla composizione delle Metamorfosi di Ovidio*. Pisa. (repr. Rome 1964).

—— (1913), "Studi alessandrini II - Atteone e Artemis." in Kekule von Stradonitz, H.F.R. and Rohden, H. von, eds.: 63-69.

Chaintraine, P. (1968-1980), *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots*. Paris.

Clausen, W.V. (1964), "Callimachus and Latin Poetry." *GRBS* 5: 181-196.

—— (1982), "Theocritus and Virgil", in Kenney, E.J. and Clausen, W.V. eds.: 5-17.

—— (1987), *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*. Berkeley.

——, ed. (1994), *A Commentary on Virgil: Eclogues*. Oxford

Clauss, J.J. (1989), "The Episode of the Lycian Farmers in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" *HSCP* 92: 297-314.

Clayman, D.L. (1980), *Callimachus' Iambi*. Leiden.

—— (1988), "Callimachus' *Iambi* and *Aetia*." *ZPE* 74: 277-286.

Cohen, B., ed. (1995), *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's "Odyssey"*. Oxford.

Cola, M. de (1937), *Callimacho e Ovidio*. Palermo.

Coleman, R. (1977), *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge.

Conte, G.B. (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Cornell.

—— (1992), "Proems in the Middle." *YCS* 29: 147-159.

—— (1994), *Genres and Readers*. (trans. G. Most) Baltimore.

Conte, G.B. and Most, G.W. (1998), "Genre", in Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. eds.: 301-302.

Crabbe, A. (1981), "Structure and Content in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." in Temporini, H. and Haase, W. eds: 2274-2276.

Curtius, E.R. (1953), *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. New York.

Dangel, J. (1995), *Accius Oeuvres* (*Fragments*). Paris.

Dawkins, R.M. (1950), *Forty-five Stories from the Dodecanese*. Cambridge.

Depew, M. (1992), "*ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν*: Genre, Occasion, and Imitation in Callimachus, frr. 191 and 203Pf." *TAPA* 122: 313-330.

—— (1993), "Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' *Hymns*", in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C., eds.: 57-77.

—— (1994), "*POxy* 2509 and Callimachus *Lavacrum Palladis*: *αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς κούρη μεγάλοιο*." *CQ* 44: 410-426.

—— (1998), "Delian Hymns and Callimachean Allusion." *HSCP* 98: 155-182.

——, and Obbink, D., eds. (2000), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, MA and London.

Derrida, J. (1973), *Speech and Phenomena, and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs*. (trans. D. Allison), Evanston, Il.

Detienne, M. and Vernant, J.-P. (1978), *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. New Jersey = *Les ruses d'intelligence: la Metis des grecs*. (1974).

Di Girolamo, C., Paccagnella, I., and Brioschi, F., eds. (1982), *La parola ritrovata: Fonti e analisi letterari*. Palermo.

Dover, K. J., ed. (1968), *Aristophanes. Clouds*. Oxford.

Due, O.S. (1974), *Changing Forms: Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Copenhagen.

Durante, M. (1960), "Ricerche sulla prehistoria della lingua poetica greca. La terminologia relativa alla creazione poetica." *Atti della Academia Nazionale dei Lincei* (*Classi de scienze morali, storiche, critiche e filologiche*) 15: 231-249.

Easterling, P.E. and Knox, B.M.W., eds. (1989), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Volume I, Part 4: The Hellenistic Period and the Empire*. Cambridge.

Eco, U. (1990), *The Limits of Interpretation*. Bloomington.

—— (1992), *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. ed. S.Collini. Cambridge.

Erbse, H. (1969-1988), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem I-VII*. Berlin.

Fantham, E. (1993), "Sunt quibus in pluris ius est transire figuras: Ovid's Self-Transformers in the Metamorphoses." *CW*: 872: 21-36.

Fantuzzi, M. (1980), "La Contaminazione dei Generi Letterari nella Letteratura Greca Ellenistica: Rifiuto del Sistema o Evoluzione di un Sistema?" *L&S* 15: 433-450.

—— (1993), "Preistoria di un genere letterario: a proposito degli *Inni* V en VI di Callimacho", in Pretagostini, R., ed.: 927-946.

Farnell, L.R. (1932), *Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar*. London.

Farrell, J. (1991), *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic*: *The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. New York and Oxford.

Fehling, D. (1972), "Erysichthon oder das Märchen von der mündlichen Überlieferung." *RhM* 115: 173-196.

Felson-Rubin, N. (1994), *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*. Princeton.

Ford, A. (1991), "Unity and Greek Poetics." *Arion* n.s. 3: 125-154.

Fowler, D. (2000), “On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies”, in Fowler, D., ed.: 115-137.
——, ed. (2000), *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford.
Fränkel, E. et al., eds. (1930), *Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein zum 2 April 1931*. Leipzig and Berlin.
Friedländer, P. (1931), *Vorklassisch und Nachklassisch*. Leipzig and Berlin.
Fuhrer, T. (1988), “A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus.” *AJPh* 109: 53-68.
—— (1993), “Callimachus’ Epinician Poems”, in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker,G.C., eds.: 79-97.
Galinsky, G.K. (1975), *Ovid’s Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*. Oxford.
Gantz, T. (1993), *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore and London.
Garner, R. (1990), *From Homer to Tragedy. The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*. London and New York.
Gentili, B. (1988), *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*. (trans. A.T. Cole) Baltimore and London. (Original edition: *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica: de Omero al V secolo*. Rome (1984)).
Giangrande, G. (1967), “‘Arte Allusiva’ and Alexandrian Poetry.” *CQ* n.s. 17: 85-97.
—— (1970), “Hellenistic Poetry and Homer.” *AC* 39: 46-77.
Gilbert, C.D. (1976), “Ovid, *Met.* 1.4.” *CQ* n.s. 26: 111-112.
Glare, P.G.W., ed. (1982), *The Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.
Greene, E. (2000), “Playing with Tradition: Gender and Innovation in the Epigrams of Anyte.” *Helios* 27.1: 15-32.
Griffith, M. (1975), “Man and the Leaves: A Study of Mimnermos Fr. 2.” *CSCA* 8: 73-88.
Guthrie, W.K.C. (1970), “Hymns”, in Hammond, N.G.L. and Scullard, H.H., eds.: 534.
Gutzwiller, K.J. (1991), *Theocritus’ Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison.
—— (1997), “Genre Development and Gendered Voices in Erinna and Nossis”, in Prins, Y. and Shreiber, M.: 202-365.
Hallaran, M.R. (1995), *Euripides Hippolytus.* Warminster.
Hammond, N.G.L. and Scullard, H.H., eds (1992 repr.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford.
Harder, M.A. (1987), “Some Thoughts about Callimachus’ *SH* 239 and 253.” *ZPE* 67: 21-30.
—— (1988), “Callimachus and the Muses: Some Aspects of Narrative Technique in *Aetia* 1-2.” *Prometheus* 14: 1-14.
—— (2002), “Intertextuality in Callimachus’ *Aetia*”, in Lehnus, L, and Hollis, A.S., et al.: 189-233.
—— (2003), “The Invention of the Past, Present and Future in Callimachus’ *Aetia*.” *Hermes* 131: 290-306.
—— (1993), “Aspects of the Structure of Callimachus’ *Aetia*”, in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C., eds.: 99-110.
——, Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C., eds. (1993), *Callimachus. Hellenistica Groningana I.* Groningen.
——, Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C., eds., (1998), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry. Hellenistica Groningana III.* Groningen.
Hardie, P.R. (1998), “Epic”, in Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A., eds.: 260-261.
—— (2002), *The Cambridge Campanion to Ovid.* Cambridge.

Harrison, S.J. (1993), "A Roman Hecale: Ovid's *Fasti* 3.661-74." *CQ* 43: 455-457.
Haslam, M. (1993), "Callimachus' *Hymns*", in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C., eds.: 111-125.
Hauthal, F., ed. (1859), *Acronis et Porphyrionis qui circumferuntur commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum*. Amsterdam.
Heath, M. (1989), *Unity in Greek Poetics*. Oxford.
Heinze, R. (1919), *Ovids elegische Erzählung. Berichte der Sächsischen Akademie zu Leipzig Philologisch-historische Klasse*. 71.7. Leipzig.
Heller, J.L. (1975), *Serta Turyniana*. Urbana, Chicago, London.
Herter, H. (1929), *Kallimachos und Homer: ein Beitrag zur Interpretation der Hymnos auf Artemis*. Bonn.
—— (1948), "Ovids Persephone-Erzählungen und ihre hellenistischen Quellen." Rheinisches *Museum* 90: 236-268.
Heubeck, A., West, S., and Hainsworth, J.B., eds. (1988-1989), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. 2 vols. Oxford.
Hinds, S. (1987), *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge.
—— (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
—— (2000), "Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius", in Depew, M. and Obbink, D., eds.: 221-244.
Hollis, A.S. (1990), *Callimachus*, *Hecale.* Oxford.
—— (1970), *Metamorphoses Book VIII*. Oxford.
Holzberg, N. (1997), *Ovid. Dichter und Werk*. München.
Hopkinson, N. (1984), *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge.
—— (1988), *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.
Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A., eds. (1996, third ed.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford.
—— (1998), *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization.* Oxford.
Hunter, R. (1993), *The Argonautica of Apollonius. Literary Studies*. Cambridge.
——, and Fuhrer, T. (2002), "Imaginary Gods? Poetic Theology in the *Hymns* of Callimachus." in Lehnus, L., Hollis, A.S., Montanari, F., eds.: 143-175.
Hutchinson, G.O. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.
Jaeger, W. (1931), *Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike*. Leipzig and Berlin.
Jan, F. de, (1893), *De Callimacho Homeri interprete*. Diss. Strassburg.
Jenkins, I. (1985), "The Ambiguity of Greek Textiles." *Arethusa* 18.2: 109-132.
Jones, W.H.S., trans. (1961), *Pausanias, Description of Greece*. London and Cambridge.
Jong, C. de, (2003), "De tranen van Niobe." *Lampas*: 188-210.
Kekule von Stradonitz, H.F.R. and Rohden, H. von (1913), *Studii critici offerti da antichi discepoli a Carlo Pascal nel suo XXV anno di insegnamento*. Catania.
Keith, A.M. (1992), *The Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 2*. Ann Arbor.
—— (2002), "Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1-5", in Boyd, B.M., ed.: 235-269.
Kenney, E.J. (1963), "Erysichthon on Cos." *Mnemosyne* 16: 57.
—— (1976), "Ovidius prooemians." *PCPS* n.s. 22: 46-53.
—— (1982), "Ovid", in Kenney, E.J. and Clausen, W.V., eds.: 124-161.
—— (1992 repr.), "Ovid", in Hammond, N.G.L. and Scullard, H.H., eds.: 763-765.
—— and Clausen, W.V., eds. (1982), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: The Age of Augustus*. Cambridge.

Kerkhecker, A. (1999), *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford.
Kleinknecht, H. (1939), "ΛΟΥΤΡΑ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΛΛΑΔΟΣ". *Hermes*: 334-339.
Knox, P.E. (1985), "The Epilogue to the *Aetia*: An Epilogue." *ZPE* 96: 59-65.
—— (1986), *Ovid's "Metamorphoses" and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge.
——— (1993), "Philetas and Roman Poetry." *PLILS* 7: 61-83.
Körte, A. and Händel, P. (1960, second ed.), *Die hellenistiche Dichtung.* Stuttgart.
Krevans, N. (1993), "Fighting Against Antimachus: The *Lyde* and the *Aetia* Reconsidered", in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C., eds.: 149-160.
Kristeva, J. (1974), *La révolution du langage poétique*. Paris.
—— (1980), *Desire in Language*. Oxford.
Kroll, W. (1924), *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart.
Kuiper, K. (1896), *Studia Callimachea I: De Hymnorum I-IV dictione epica*. Leiden.
Lacy, L. R. (1990), "Aktaion and a Lost 'Bath of Artemis'." *JHS* 60 : 26-42.
Lafaye, G. (1904), *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs*. Paris.
Leach, E.W. (1981), "Metamorphoses of the Actaeon Myth in Campanian Painting." *Röm. Mitt.* 88: 307-327.
Lehnus, L. (2000), Nuova *bibliografia callimachea: 1489-1998*. Alessandria.
——, Hollis, A.S., Montanari, F., Parsons, P., Hunter, R., Fuhrer, T., Harder, M.A., Stephens, S., eds. (2002), *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, Tome 68: Callimaque*. Vancoeuvres and Genève.
Levaniouk, O. (2000), "Aithôn, Aithon, and Odysseus." *HSCP*: 25-51.
Lewis, C.T., ed. (1879), *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.
Linders, T. and Nordquist, G., eds. (1987), *Gifts to the Gods*. Stockholm. (= *Boreas*. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 15).
Livrea, E. (1972), "Una 'tecnica allusiva' apolloniana alla luce dell' esegesi omerica alessandrina." *SIFC* 44: 231-243.
Lobel, E. (1964), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, *Part XXX* (Nos. 2507-2530). Oxford.
Ludwig, W. (1965), *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids*. Berlin.
Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1984), "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Callimachus, and l'art pour l'art." *MD* 12: 9-34.
Mair, G.R. (1960), *Callimachus. Hymns and Epigrams. Lycophron. Aratus*. Cambridge, MA and London.
Malten, L. (1911), *Kyrene: sagengeschichichtliche und historische Untersuchungen*. Berlin.
Martin, R.P. (1989), *The Language of Heroes. Speech and Performance in the "Iliad"*. Ithaca and London.
Martini, E. (1933), *Einleitung zu Ovid.* Prague.
Matthews, V.J. (1996), *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary*. Leiden.
McKay, K.J. (1962a), *Erysichthon: A Callimachean Comedy*. Leiden.
—— (1962b), *The Poet at Play. Kallimachos: The Bath of Pallas*. Leiden.
Miller, A.M. (1986), *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Leiden.
Miller, J.F. (1976), *Roman Elegiac Aitia. Propertius IV and Ovid's Fasti in Light of the Poetry of Callimachus*. Chapel Hill.
—— (1992), "The *Fasti* and Hellenistic Didactics. Ovid's Variant Aetiologies." *Arethusa* 25: 11-32.
Mineur, W.H., ed. (1984), *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos. Introduction and Commentary.* Leiden.
Most, G. (1981), "Callimachus and Herophilus." *Hermes* 109:188-196.

Müller, C.W. (1987), *Erysichthon. Der Mythos als narrative Metapher im Demeterhymnos des Kallimachos*. Mainz and Stuttgart.

Murnaghan, S. (1995), "The Plan of Athena," in Cohen, B., ed.: 61-80.

Myers, K.S. (1994), *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor.

Nagy, G. (1990), *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.

Newman, J.K. (1974), "Callimachus and the Epic", in Heller, J.L., ed.: 342-60.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. (1970) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes: Book 1*. Oxford.

Otis, B. (1970, second ed.), *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge.

Page, D.L. (1955), *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford

Papastavrou, H. (1984), *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologicum*. Class II 1. Zürich.

Parsons, P.J. (1998), "Callimachus." in Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A., eds.: 132-138.

Pasquali, G. (1942), "Arte allusiva." *Italia che scrive* 25: 185ff. = *Stravaganze quarte e supreme* (Venice 1951) 11ff = *Pagine stravaganti II* (Florence 1968): 275 ff.

Perrotta, G. (1924-1926), "Teocrito interprete di Omero." *SIFC* n.s. 4: 202-216.

Pfeiffer, R. (1928), "Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos." *Hermes* 63: 302-341.

—— (1955), "The Future of Studies in the Field of Hellenistic Poetry." *JHS* 75: 69-73.

—— (1968), *A History of Classical Scholarship*. Oxford.

Plaehn, G. (1882), *De Nicandro aliisque poetis Graecis ab Ovidio in Metamorphosibus conscribendis adhibitis*. Halle.

Pohlenz, M. (1933), "Kallimachos' *Aitia*." *Hermes* 68: 313-327.

Poliakoff, M. (1980), "Nectar, Springs and the Sea: Critical Terminology in Pindar and Callimachus." *ZPE* 39: 41-47.

Preller, L. and Robert, C. (1894-1921), *Griechische Mythologie*. 4 vols. Berlin.

Pretagostini, R., ed. (1993), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica: Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili*. Rome.

Prins, Y. and Shreiber, M., eds. (1997), *Dwelling in Possibility: Woman Poets and Critics on Poetry*. Ithaca and London.

Puelma Piwonka, M. (1949), *Lucilius und Kallimachos: Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie*. Frankfurt.

Radermacher, L. (1938), *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen*. Baden bei Wein.

Reeder, E.D., ed. (1995), *Pandora: Women in Classical Greece*. Baltimore.

Reiff, A. (1959), *Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio. Begriff und Vorstellung literarischen Abhängigkeit bei den Römern*. Diss. Köln.

Reinsch-Werner, H. (1976), *Callimachus Hesiodicus: Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene*. Berlin.

Reitzenstein, E. (1931), "Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos" in Fränkel, E., et al.., eds.: 23-69.

Richards, I.A. (1963 repr.), *Principles of Literary Criticism*. London.

Richardson, N. (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary: Books 21-24*. Cambridge.

Roscher, W.H. (1884-1937), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. 9 vols. Leipzig.

Rösler, W. (1980), *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*. Munich.

Ross, D.O. (1969), *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, MA.

—— (1975), *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome*. Cambridge.

Rossi, L.E. (1971), "I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche." *BICS* 18: 69-94.

Rudhardt, J. (1992), "De l'attitude des Grecs à l'égard des religions étrangères." *RHR*: 219-238

Rutherford, I. (1988), "Pindar on the Birth of Apollo." *CQ*: 65-75.

Schein, S.L. (1996), *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretative Essays*. Princeton.

Schenkeveld, D.M. (1992), "Unity and Variety in Ancient Criticism. Some Observations on a Recent Study." *Mnemosyne* 45.1: 1-8.

Schlam, C.C. (1984), "Diana and Actaeon: Metamorphosis of a Myth." *ClAnt* 3: 82-109.

Schmiel, R. (1987), "Callimachus *Hymn to Delos*: Structure and Theme." *Mnemosyne* 40: 45-55.

Schmitz, T.A. (1999), "'I Hate All Common Things': The Reader's Role in Callimachus *Aetia* Prologue." *HSCPh* 99: 151-178.

Schwinge, E.R. (1981), "Griechische Poesie und die Lehre von der Gattungstrinität in der Moderne." *AuA* 27: 130-162.

Segre, C. (1982), "Intertestuale-interdiscorsivo: Appunti per un fenomenologia delle fonti", in Di Girolamo, C. and Paccagnella, I., eds.: 15-28.

Shorey, P. and Laing, G.L., eds. (1919), *Horace: Odes and Epodes*. Chicago, New York, Boston.

Sider, D. (2001), "As Is the Generation of Leaves in Homer, Simonides, Horace, and Stobaeus", in Boedeker, D. and Sider, D., eds. : 272-288.

Skiadas, A.D., ed. (1975), *Kallimachos, Wege der Forschung* 296. Darmstadt.

Slater, W.J. (1969), *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.

Smiley, M.T. (1919), "Callimachean Debt to Pindar and Others." *Hermathena* 18: 46-72

Snell, B. (1953), *The Discovery of the Mind. The Greek Origins of European Thought*. Oxford.

Solodow, J.B. (1988), *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Chapel Hill.

Sommerstein, A.H. (1980), *Comedies of Aristophanes, Volume I: Archarnians*. Warminster.

Souter, A., Wyllie, J.M., Brink, C.O., eds. (1968), *The Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.

Starkie, N.J.M. (1909), *The Archarnians of Aristophanes*. Amsterdam.

Stephens, S. (2003), *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley.

Svenbro, J. (1976), *La parole et le marbre. Aux origines de la poétique grecque*. Lund.

Tarrant, R. (2002), "Ovid and Ancient Literary History", in Hardie, P., ed.: 21-23.

Temporini, H. and Haase, W., eds. (1981), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. II.31.4.2274-2327. Berlin.

Thomas, R. F. (1982), "Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (64.1-18)." *AJPh* 103: 144-164.

—— (1986), "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference." *HSCP* 90: 171-198.

——, ed.(1988), *Virgil. Georgics, Volume 1, Books I-II*. Cambridge.

—— (1993), "Callimachus Back in Rome" in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C., eds.: 197-215.

Trypanis, C.A. (1958), *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Lyric Poems, Hecale, Minor Epic and Elegiac Poems, Fragments of Epigrams, Fragments of Uncertain Location*. Cambridge, MA and London.

Ugolini, G. (1995), *Untersuchungen zur Figur des Sehers Teiresias*. Tübingen.

Valk, M. van der, ed. (1971-1987), *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes ad Fidem Codicis Laurentiani*. Vol. 1-4. Leiden.

Vogliano, A. (1937), *Papiri della R. Universita di Milano I.* Milan.
Vollgraff, W. (1909), *Nikander und Ovid.* Groningen.
Vollmer, F. and Bickel, E., eds. (1900-), *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. Leipzig.
West, D. (1997), *Horace. The Complete Odes and Epodes*. Oxford.
West, M.L. (1962), "Echoes and Imitations of the Hesiodic Poems." *Philologus* 113: 8.
——, ed. (1985), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Oxford.
Whallon, W. (1961), "The Homeric Epithets," *YCIS* 17: 97-142.
Wheeler, S.M. (1999), *A Discourse of Wonders. Audiences and Performances in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Philadelphia.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. (1922), *Pindaros.* Berlin.
—— (1924), *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos.* 2 vols. Berlin.
Wilkinson, L.P. (1953), "Greek Influence on the Poetry of Ovid." *Entretiens sur l'Antiquite Classique Tome II, L'influence grecque sur la Poésie Latine de Catulle à Ovide*. Genèva: 223-43.
—— (1955), *Ovid Recalled.* Cambridge.
Willcock, M.M. (1964), "Mythological paradeigma in the *Iliad.*" *CQ* 14: 144-154.
Willcock, M.M., ed. (1970), *The Iliad of Homer*. 2 vols. Basingstoke.
Williams, F. (1978), *Callimachus. Hymn to Apollo*. Oxford.
Wimmel, W. (1960), *Kallimachos in Rom: die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*. Wiesbaden.
Wimsatt, W.K. and Beardsley, M.C. (1946), "Intentional Fallacy." *Sewanee Review* 54: 468-88.
Winkler, J. (1990), "Penelope‘s Cunning and Homer's." in Winkler, J., ed.: 129-161.
Winkler, J., ed. (1990), *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. New York.
Wüst, E. (1940), "Penelope." *RE* 19, 479-493.
Wyss, B. (1936), *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae*. Berlin.
Zanker, G. (1987), *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and its Audience*. Beckenham.
Zetzel, J.E.G. (1983), "Catullus, Ennius, and the Poetics of Allusion." *ICS* 8: 251-266.
—— (1983), "Recreating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past." *CI* 10: 83-105.
Ziegler, K. (1966, second ed.), *Das hellenistische Epos*. Leipzig.

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

ACCIUS
Fr. 8 6,181

AESCHYLUS
Fr. 423a 83
Agamemnon 319 34, 37

ANTONINUS LIBERALIS
Metamorphoses 35 138, 140, 150

APOLLODORUS
Bibliotheca 1.4.1 115, 138, 141, 142
Bibliotheca 3.5.6 139, 146, 147
Bibliotheca 3.6.7 75, 81, 83
Bibliotheca 4.4.4 79

APOLLONIUS OF RHODES
Argonautica 1.649 35
Argonautica 1.725 12
Argonautica 1.847 35
Argonautica 2.390-391 36
Argonautica 2.468-489 167
Argonautica 3.401 35
Argonautica 4.1247 32

ARISTOPHANES
Acharnenses 441-442 47
Acharnenses 445 47
Nubes 229-230 49
Nubes 320-349 49
Nubes 359 49
Nubes 740-742 49
Nubes 1404 49
Nubes 1496 49
Ranae 814 47
Ranae 828 48
Ranae 876 48
Ranae 892 47
Ranae 956 48
Ranae 1108 48
Ranae 1111 48
Ranae 1395-1500 48
Lysistratra 25-30 46-47

ARISTOTLE
Rhetorica 3.1415a12f. 24

ATHENAEUS
Fr. 416B=*FGH* 4F6 165

BACCHYLIDES
Paeans Fr. 5 111

CALLIMACHUS
Aetia Fr. 1.1-40 28-29
Aetia Fr. 1.3 27
Aetia Fr. 1.3-5 28
Aetia Fr. 1.10-12 28, 37
Aetia Fr. 1.11 29, 60
Aetia Fr. 1.13-18 28
Aetia Fr. 1.19 47, 48
Aetia 1.20 60, 67
Aetia 1.23 64
Aetia Fr. 1.23-24 28
Aetia Fr. 1.24 26, 29, 55
Aetia Fr. 1.25-29 27,28,29
Aetia Fr. 1.29-34 29
Aetia Fr. 178.8, 11-12 60
Aetia Frr. 3-7 75
Aetia Frr. 26-31 75
Aetia Frr. 65-66 75
Epigramata 28.3b-4 157
Hymn 2.4-5 153

CALLIMACHUS (*cont.*)
Hymn 2.22-24 139
Hymn 2.22-25 144
Hymn 4.11-50 150
Hymn 4.17 12
Hymn 4.28 128
Hymn 4.28-274 113
Hymn 4.29 128
Hymn 4.30-32 119
Hymn 4.30-35 114
Hymn 4.30-48 119, 125
Hymn 4.30-50 115, 152
Hymn 4.33 12
Hymn 4.35 128
Hymn 4.35-36 114, 130
Hymn 4.36-38 129
Hymn 4.36-40 132
Hymn 4.37 114
Hymn 4.37-38 114
Hymn 4.40 128
Hymn 4.41 128
Hymn 4.44 128
Hymn 4.49 128
Hymn 4.51-54 114, 128, 131, 132
Hymn 4.55 149
Hymn 4.55-69 114
Hymn 4.68-69 149
Hymn 4.68-195 150
Hymn 4.68-204 125
Hymn 4.70-195 114, 119
Hymn 4.79 12
Hymn 4.86-98 114
Hymn 4.88-98 144, 147
Hymn 4.90-122 115
Hymn 4.95-98 155
Hymn 4.96-97 139, 144
Hymn 4.109-116 122
Hymn 4.109-133 114
Hymn 4.109-152 122
Hymn 4.114-115 97
Hymn 4.122-132 122
Hymn 4.140-164 118
Hymn 4.150 134, 148
Hymn 4.150-152 114, 122
Hymn 4.160-190 136
Hymn 4.196-205 123, 152
Hymn 4.202-203 131
Hymn 4.203-204 114, 123, 149
Hymn 4.209-211 154
Hymn 4.215-231 123
Hymn 4.216-239 132
Hymn 4.218-220 123
Hymn 4.225 124
Hymn 4.228-231 123
Hymn 4.239-242 124
Hymn 4.240-248 114
Hymn 4.244-246 133
Hymn 4.244-249 124
Hymn 4.247-248 133, 142
Hymn 4.249-274 114
Hymn 4.260-263 154
Hymn 4.275-326 115, 118
Hymn 4.475-525 118
Hymn 4.532-544 118
Hymn 5.13-17 73, 90
Hymn 5.31 91
Hymn 5.31-32 89, 90
Hymn 5.35-42 90
Hymn 5.5-12 73, 90
Hymn 5.51-54 90
Hymn 5.56 86
Hymn 5.57-69 89
Hymn 5.57-136 89
Hymn 5.60-64 89
Hymn 5.66-67 90
Hymn 5.70-74 98
Hymn 5.70-84 89
Hymn 5.72 99
Hymn 5.74 99
Hymn 5.75 91
Hymn 5.75-76 99
Hymn 5.76 99
Hymn 5.77-81 103
Hymn 5.78 99
Hymn 5.79 92
Hymn 5.83-84 92, 100

CALLIMACHUS (*cont.*)
Hymn 5.85-92 100, 106
Hymn 5.90-92 93
Hymn 5.93-95 93
Hymn 5.97-130 106
Hymn 5.98-102 104
Hymn 5.103-106 104
Hymn 5.104-105 99
Hymn 5.107-118 74, 91, 104, 109
Hymn 5.109 97
Hymn 5.110-111 102
Hymn 5.111-116 82
Hymn 5.114 91
Hymn 5.111-114 93, 94
Hymn 5.113-114 97
Hymn 5.117-118 100
Hymn 5.119-136 89
Hymn 5.129-130 95
Hymn 5.137 106
Hymn 6.2 162
Hymn 6.3-6 162
Hymn 6.7-9 162, 169
Hymn 6.8-9 169
Hymn 6.10-16 162, 169
Hymn 6.13 170
Hymn 6.13-15 170
Hymn 6.14 170
Hymn 6.15 170
Hymn 6.17 170
Hymn 6.18 162
Hymn 6.19-21 162
Hymn 6.22 170, 172
Hymn 6.22-23 162
Hymn 6.24-28 172
Hymn 6.24-32 162
Hymn 6.24-67 168
Hymn 6.28-29 173
Hymn 6.29 174
Hymn 6.32-36 162
Hymn 6.37 186
Hymn 6.37-38 162
Hymn 6.38 187
Hymn 6.39-49 162
Hymn 6.46-53 187
Hymn 6.50-51 176
Hymn 6.50-52 175
Hymn 6.50-55 163
Hymn 6.56-64 163
Hymn 6.65-67 163
Hymn 6.66-67 164, 165, 176, 187
Hymn 6.66-80 176
Hymn 6.68-95 163
Hymn 6.88-90 187
Hymn 6.88-93 176
Hymn 6.96-110 163
Hymn 6.98 177
Hymn 6.98-100 177
Hymn 6.102 178
Hymn 6.111-115 163
Hymn 6.113 188
Hymn 6.114 177
Hymn 6.114-115 176
Hymn 6.116-117 162, 171
Hymn 6.116-123 163
Hymn 6.118-123 162
Hymn 6.137 168
Iambi Fr. 194 153
Iambi Fr. 203 153

CATULLUS
c. 64.1-2 84
c. 64.130-135, 143-144 18, 85, 86
c. 64.311-313 57
c. 101 16

DIODORUS SICULUS
Bibliotheca 4.81.4 78
Bibliotheca 5.61 166

EURIPIDES
Bacchae 337-341 78, 82
Medea 529 41, 53
Medea 786 51, 53
Medea 949 53
Medea 1082 46, 47
Medea 1188 53

EURIPIDES (*cont.*)
Hippolytus 133 53
Hippolytus 923 44, 46
Phoenissae 159 139

HESIOD
Catalogue of Women, Fr. 43a2-69 164
Melampodia, Fr. 275 75, 81
Melampodia, Fr. 275.2 82
Melampodia, Fr. 275.9 82
Melampodia, Fr. 275.11-12 82
Melampodia, Fr. 275.13 82
POxy 2509 77, 88
Theogony 211-230 183
Theogony 404-410 133, 148
Theogony 404-412 138
Theogony 627 34
Theogony 812 32
Works and Days 346-348 171
Works and Days 828 170

HOMER
Hymn to Apollo 16-18 153
Hymn to Apollo 19 118
Hymn to Apollo 25 119
Hymn to Apollo 28-29 118
Hymn to Apollo 30-32 119
Hymn to Apollo 30-48 119, 125, 150
Hymn to Apollo 30-50 115, 152
Hymn to Apollo 45-46 149
Hymn to Apollo 47-48 149
Hymn to Apollo 51-60 152
Hymn to Apollo 51-89 115, 123
Hymn to Apollo 90-122 115
Hymn to Apollo 92-101 124
Hymn to Apollo 102-112 124
Hymn to Apollo 131-132 121
Hymn to Apollo 140-164 118
Hymn to Apollo 214 119
Hymn to Apollo 225-228 122
Hymn to Apollo 255 32
Hymn to Apollo 295 32
Hymn to Apollo 459 12
Hymn to Apollo 475-525 118
Hymn to Apollo 532-544 118
Hymn to Demeter 96-117 175
Hymn to Demeter 98-99 170
Iliad 1.11-42 175
Iliad 1.423 12
Iliad 1.571 33
Iliad 2.433 33
Iliad 3.212 51
Iliad 5.48-57 94-95
Iliad 5.420 33
Iliad 6.146-148 8
Iliad 6.146-149 7
Iliad 6.187 51
Iliad 6.513-514 174
Iliad 7.321 32
Iliad 7.347 33
Iliad 9.411 9
Iliad 10.224-226 44
Iliad 11.37 183
Iliad 12.131ff. 186
Iliad 12.297 32
Iliad 14.170-186 89
Iliad 14.175-178 89
Iliad 14.225ff. 183
Iliad 15.711 174
Iliad 17.133-136 175
Iliad 17.135-136 175
Iliad 18.637 51
Iliad 19.398 173
Iliad 20.403-405 182
Iliad 21.234 174
Iliad 23.230 174
Iliad 23.587-590 44, 45
Iliad 24.532 178
Iliad 24.599-617 145
Iliad 24.601-619 120
Iliad 24.602 145
Iliad 24.602-617 138
Iliad 24.607-608 146
Iliad 24.611 121

HOMER (*cont.*)
Odyssey 1.1-4 16
Odyssey 1.367 33
Odyssey 2.11-12 91
Odyssey 2.15 33
Odyssey 2.95 52
Odyssey 2.151 12
Odyssey 4.703-705 92
Odyssey 4.836 33
Odyssey 4.836-837 33
Odyssey 5.63-73 172
Odyssey 5.64 172
Odyssey 5.70 172
Odyssey 6.105-106 91
Odyssey 7.114 172
Odyssey 7.114-132 172
Odyssey 7.115 172
Odyssey 7.129 172
Odyssey 7.208-211 172
Odyssey 7.241 33
Odyssey 7.242 34
Odyssey 8.280 52
Odyssey 9.528-535 177
Odyssey 9.529 177
Odyssey 10.233 52
Odyssey 10.490-495 95
Odyssey 11.363-366 51
Odyssey 12.55-58 34
Odyssey 12.56 33
Odyssey 12.134 32
Odyssey 13.195 32
Odyssey 13.298-299 50
Odyssey 13.303 51
Odyssey 13.386 51
Odyssey 13.439 51
Odyssey 14.131-132 51
Odyssey 14.437 32
Odyssey 15.166 33
Odyssey 16.15 93
Odyssey 16.345 33
Odyssey 17.38-40 93, 94
Odyssey 17.39 93
Odyssey 17.97 52
Odyssey 18.375 32
Odyssey 19.140 51
Odyssey 19.417 93
Odyssey 24.130 52

HORACE
Ars Poetica 68-72 1
Ars Poetica 128-130 58
Ars Poetica 131-136 158
Epodes 2.1.224-225 57
Epodes 2.1.225 56, 64
Odes 1.7 39-42

HYGINUS
Fabulae 181 83

LYCOPHRON
Alexandra 1393-1396 165, 176

MANILIUS
Astronomica 1.1-6 62-63
Astronomica 2.7-11 63

MIMNERMUS
Fr. 2.1-8 8

"MUSAEUS"
Fr. 5d 7

OVID
Amores 1.1.23 67
Amores 2.1.3 67
Amores 2.1.11-17 67
Amores 2.1.17-22 67
Amores 2.1.21 67
Amores 2.1.23-28 68
Amores 2.1.38 68
Fasti 3.469-475 18
Fasti 3.471-476 85-86
Metamorphoses 1.1-4 26, 27
Metamorphoses 1.3-4 42, 70
Metamorphoses 1.4 26
Metamorphoses 3.22-331 80

OVID (*cont.*)
Metamorphoses 3.104-105 99
Metamorphoses 3.135-137 109
Metamorphoses 3.140 97
Metamorphoses 3.141-142 100
Metamorphoses 3.143-154 80
Metamorphoses 3.143-157 98
Metamorphoses 3.146 97
Metamorphoses 3.146-154 99
Metamorphoses 3.155-164 80
Metamorphoses 3.155-172 81
Metamorphoses 3.156 100
Metamorphoses 3.173-205 81
Metamorphoses 3.175-176 97, 99
Metamorphoses 3.176 99
Metamorphoses 3.186-193 103-104
Metamorphoses 3.192-193 104
Metamorphoses 3.193-205 101-102
Metamorphoses 3.198-199 100
Metamorphoses 3.201 100
Metamorphoses 3.206-225 81, 83
Metamorphoses 3.225-352 81, 97
Metamorphoses 3.251-255 87-88
Metamorphoses 3.316-318 108
Metamorphoses 3.316-338 80
Metamorphoses 3.318-319 87
Metamorphoses 3.318-322 80
Metamorphoses 3.318-348 108
Metamorphoses 3.322-323 80
Metamorphoses 3.324-327 82
Metamorphoses 3.333 82
Metamorphoses 3.333-335 87
Metamorphoses 3.333-338 80
Metamorphoses 3.338 82
Metamorphoses 3.511-512 108
Metamorphoses 3.719-720 108
Metamorphoses 5.250-678 158
Metamorphoses 6.1-145 137, 158
Metamorphoses 6.108 141
Metamorphoses 6.103-107 141
Metamorphoses 6.103-114 141
Metamorphoses 6.109 138
Metamorphoses 6.146-203 137
Metamorphoses 6.146-312 137, 158
Metamorphoses 6.165-169 145
Metamorphoses 6.170-172 146
Metamorphoses 6.177 156
Metamorphoses 6.178 156
Metamorphoses 6.179 156
Metamorphoses 6.182-183 147
Metamorphoses 6.184-186 148
Metamorphoses 6.186-188 149
Metamorphoses 6.186-191 152
Metamorphoses 6.189-191 1543 155
Metamorphoses 6.190-191 149
Metamorphoses 6.191 149
Metamorphoses 6.204-217 137
Metamorphoses 6.218-220 146
Metamorphoses 6.218-302 137
Metamorphoses 6.269 157
Metamorphoses 6.271-272 146
Metamorphoses 6.288-301 146
Metamorphoses 6.301-312 143
Metamorphoses 6.303-312 137
Metamorphoses 6.313-381 137, 140
Metamorphoses 6.317 152
Metamorphoses 6.319 155
Metamorphoses 6.320 157
Metamorphoses 6.325 157
Metamorphoses 6.331-338 137
Metamorphoses 6.332-333 152
Metamorphoses 6.333-334 152, 156
Metamorphoses 6.335-338 153
Metamorphoses 6.339-381 138
Metamorphoses 6.343 157
Metamorphoses 6.345 157
Metamorphoses 6.349 158
Metamorphoses 6.365 157
Metamorphoses 6.350 157
Metamorphoses 6.351 157, 158
Metamorphoses 6.352-354 150
Metamorphoses 6.358-359 156
Metamorphoses 6.372 157
Metamorphoses 6.373 157
Metamorphoses 6.382-400 158
Metamorphoses 8.260-884 189

Ovid (*cont.*)
Metamorphoses 8.547-559 190
Metamorphoses 8.577-589 190
Metamorphoses 8.590-610 190
Metamorphoses 8.620-724 190
Metamorphoses 8.738 181
Metamorphoses 8.738-878 22, 163, 190
Metamorphoses 8.739-740 163, 181
Metamorphoses 8.741-742 186
Metamorphoses 8.741-750 163
Metamorphoses 8.743 186
Metamorphoses 8.746 187
Metamorphoses 8.751-756 163
Metamorphoses 8.754 181
Metamorphoses 8.757-758 182
Metamorphoses 8.761 181
Metamorphoses 8.761-762 182
Metamorphoses 8.763-764 182
Metamorphoses 8.765 182
Metamorphoses 8.765-769 187
Metamorphoses 8.765-770 181
Metamorphoses 8.767 187
Metamorphoses 8.771-773 163
Metamorphoses 8.774-795 163
Metamorphoses 8.775-776 183
Metamorphoses 8.784-787 184
Metamorphoses 8.785-822 183
Metamorphoses 8.792 181
Metamorphoses 8.796-822 164
Metamorphoses 8.796-822 164
Metamorphoses 8.817 181
Metamorphoses 8.823-842 164
Metamorphoses 8.828 187
Metamorphoses 8.835 181
Metamorphoses 8.835-836 188
Metamorphoses 8.835-842 184
Metamorphoses 8.843-844 188
Metamorphoses 8.843-848 164
Metamorphoses 8.847 181
Metamorphoses 8.848-851 164
Metamorphoses 8.852-869 164
Metamorphoses 8.855-868 185
Metamorphoses 8.870-874 164
Metamorphoses 8.875-878 164
Tristia 2.557-560 42

Pindar
Fr. 33c-33d 115
Fr. 33c 128
Fr. 33.c.1 130
Fr. 33c.4 130
Fr. 33c.4-6 116
Fr. 33c.5 131
Fr. 33d 128 131
Fr. 33d.1-3 116
Fr. 33d.3-9 116
Fr. 33d.5-9 130
Paean 5 138
Paean 5.42 116, 131
Paean 7b.42 133
Paean 7b.42-47 116
Paean 7b.42-51 132
Paean 7b.43 134
Paean 7b.43-44 133
Paean 7b.43-52 128, 138
Paean 7b.45 133
Paean 7b.46-48 130
Paean 7b.47 131
Paean 7b.48 116, 133
Paean 7b.49-51 116
Paean 12.9-14 116
Paean 12.14-16 116

Plato
Respublica 3.392d-394c 5

Propertius
Elegia 1.16.41 60, 61
Elegia 2.1.25 60
Elegia 2.1.39-42 60, 61
Elegia 2.7.33B.35-40 59
Elegia 2.10.7-8 61
Elegia 2.10.12 61
Elegia 2.20.1-8 143
Elegia 2.33.38 61
Elegia 3.1.1-2 61
Elegia 3.1.3 61

PROPERTIUS (*cont.*)
Elegia 3.1.5 61
Elegia 3.1.8 61
Elegia 3.1.14 61
Elegia 3.1.18 61
Elegia 3.3.15 61
Elegia 3.3.18 61
Elegia 3.3.26 61
Elegia 3.3.52 61

SENECA
Suasoriae 3.7 72

SOPHOCLES
Antigone 822-832 139, 143
Electra 145-152 143
Electra 150-152 139

VIRGIL
Aeneid 2.50-53 182
Aeneid 2.223-224 182
Aeneid 3.420 185
Aeneid 4.441 186
Aeneid 6.692-693 16
Aeneid 7.323 184
Aeneid 7.653-654 181
Eclogue 6.1 67
Eclogue 6.1-8 63-65

GENERAL INDEX

Accius, 6, 181
Acron and Porphyry, 39
Actaeon, 22, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 91, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 193
Adam, 31, 37
aemulatio, 7, 8, 11, 17
Aeschylus, 27, 34, 35, 36, 37, 43, 47, 48, 83, 138, 139, 145
Aethon, 160, 164, 165, 166, 176, 177, 178, 188
αἴθων, 166, 176, 177
Alexandrian, 2, 13, 17, 58, 84, 85, 86, 117, 186
Alexandrian footnote, 84
anti-Aristotelian, 30
Antoninus, 81, 140, 141, 150, 151, 155, 166
Apollo, 32, 39, 54, 61, 64, 66, 67, 78, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 141, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 158, 174, 175, 192
Apollonius, 12, 32, 35, 36, 37, 43, 91, 167
Arachne, 137, 141, 158
Aristophanes, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 54, 65, 192
Aristotle, 5, 24, 30
Arte allusiva, 11
Artemis, 55, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 87, 90, 91, 94, 95, 103, 104, 107, 112, 115, 116, 117, 123, 137, 139, 145, 146, 147, 153
Asteria, 22, 112, 114, 115, 116, 119, 120, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 141, 142, 148, 149, 152, 155, 190
Asterie, 136, 138, 141, 148, 156
Athena, 33, 50, 52, 73, 74, 76, 77, 79, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 137, 174, 179, 193
Augustan, 3, 6, 13, 26, 27, 39, 41, 55, 56, 57, 62, 63, 66, 84, 107, 142, 158
authenticate, 120, 167
authorization
authorize, 112, 136, 148, 155, 158, 161, 194, 196

Bing, 113, 115, 118, 119, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 169
Brink, 30, 158
Bulloch, 1, 2, 12, 38, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 99, 102, 104, 106, 107, 161, 168, 169, 175

Callimachean, 2, 4, 13, 14, 25, 27, 31, 38, 40, 42, 45, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 68, 69, 70, 77, 81, 82, 90, 94, 99, 102, 105, 107, 114, 121, 122, 123, 125, 134, 135, 149, 157, 158, 159, 160, 164, 167, 172, 173, 174, 177, 187, 188, 191, 192
Cameron, 27, 29, 30, 31, 37, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 55, 63, 65, 66
Catullus, 2, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 56, 57, 68, 84, 85
Ceres, 163, 184, 186
certamen, 144
Chariclo, 74, 76, 77, 79, 81, 88, 90, 92, 93, 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107
Clausen, 1, 2, 13, 14, 57, 64
Clauss, 140, 150, 156, 157, 158
Coeus, 129, 132, 134, 138, 148
Conte, 5, 6, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 85, 170, 173, 191
Contean, 15, 17, 54, 70, 191

deducere, 56, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68
deducite, 26, 27, 31, 42, 43, 55, 57, 68, 69, 70, 192
deducite…carmen, 55
deductum, 26, 55, 56, 58, 63, 64, 65, 68, 192
Delos, 22, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 142, 144, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 158, 161, 194
Demeter, 28, 48, 160, 161, 162, 164, 167, 168, 169, 171, 174, 176, 179, 184, 187, 189, 195, 196
Depew, 2, 5, 7, 14, 73, 76, 77, 104, 113, 115, 117, 118, 125, 126, 128, 131, 132, 134, 135, 168
Detienne, 45, 50, 52
διηνεκές, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 54, 68, 70, 192
διηνεκῶς, 33, 34
διηνεκέως, 33, 34, 35, 36
Du-Stil, 128, 156, 167

ἕν, 30, 31, 40
Ennius, 61, 69, 184
Erysichthon, 22, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 171, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 196
Euripides, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 61, 65, 78, 82, 138, 139, 140, 169, 183, 192
exemplum(exempla), 41, 74, 77, 79, 94, 104, 142

gap, 9, 10
Garner, 9, 10
genre, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 19, 22, 25, 26, 27, 31, 37, 38, 40, 41, 48, 54, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 107, 110, 112, 117, 118, 126, 127, 135, 136, 156, 161, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 179, 180, 189, 192, 194, 195, 196
Giangrande, 12, 13, 14, 17
ground, 4, 9, 10, 170

hapax legomena, 12
Harder, 2, 7, 25, 29, 55, 59
Haslam, 74, 76, 77, 79, 104, 107, 115, 117, 119, 123, 125, 126, 132, 134, 135
Heath, 30, 36
Hellenistic, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 24, 25, 27, 38, 40, 43, 45, 48, 49, 51, 60, 63, 64, 66, 74, 79, 86, 96, 115, 117, 118, 122, 125, 126, 127, 134, 152, 158, 164, 191, 195
Hera, 75, 81, 87, 89, 90, 91, 114, 115, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 132, 137, 140, 149, 150, 151, 152, 183, 184
Hesiod, 25, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 44, 75, 78, 81, 82, 83, 97, 108, 122, 133, 138, 148, 164, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 176, 180, 183, 185
Hinds, 6, 17, 20, 21, 27, 84, 85, 87, 173, 186
Hippocrene, 98, 99, 157
Homer, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 61, 62, 63, 65, 79, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 120, 121, 135, 138, 145, 146, 155, 161, 171, 172, 173, 175, 177, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 189, 192
Homeric, 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 25, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 44, 46, 52, 54, 55, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 105, 110, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 141, 143, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 167, 168, 169, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 179, 182, 183, 184, 186, 192
Hopkinson, 45, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 185
Horace, 1, 6, 11, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 56, 57, 58, 61, 64, 67, 68, 158, 160, 192
Hubbard, 39, 40, 41

imitatio, 7
integrative allusion, 17, 20, 38, 43, 54, 70, 71, 72, 93, 97, 99, 103, 104, 105, 110, 112, 117, 120, 126, 136, 144,

148, 151, 161, 168, 170, 171, 172, 176, 177, 179, 180, 181, 184, 185, 189, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196
intentional fallacy, 19
intertextuality, 21
ira numinis, 144
Iris, 115, 123, 125, 132

Knox, 2, 15, 26, 27, 28
Kristeva, 21

Laing, 40
Latona, 112, 115, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159
λεπτὴ μῆτις, 45
λεπταλέην, 26, 28, 29, 46, 47, 49, 54, 55, 56, 60, 63, 65, 67, 192
λεπταλέος, 26, 43, 51
λεπτός, 26, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 61, 63, 65, 67, 157, 192
Leto, 22, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 146, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 190
Levaniouk, 176, 177
locus amoenus(loci amoeni), 172, 174

Manilius, 56, 62, 63
mark, 1, 73, 169
Martin, 33
McKay, 73, 79, 122, 164, 165, 166, 173, 176, 178, 179, 181, 185
Mestra, 163, 164, 166, 181, 184, 185, 186, 188
Metamorphoses, 2, 3, 4, 6, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 39, 41, 42, 55, 56, 66, 68, 69, 70, 72, 79, 80, 82, 83, 105, 107, 109, 111, 112, 136, 141, 142, 155, 156, 158, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166, 180, 189, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196
Metis, 50
μῆτις, 44, 45, 50, 52, 53
mimetic, 5, 73, 74, 88, 106, 117, 118, 161, 162, 163, 168, 169, 170, 171, 178, 179, 185, 189, 196
μίμησις, 7
Mimnermus, 8, 9, 10, 28, 37, 138
Mineur, 113, 115, 117, 122, 125, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 154

Nausicaa, 91
Nicander, 43, 140, 141, 150, 165, 166, 186
Niobe, 22, 111, 115, 120, 122, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 155, 156, 158
Nisbet, 39, 40, 41

oppositio in imitando, 12, 13, 14, 17, 134
Ortygia, 116, 123, 129, 133, 138, 139, 153
Ovidian, 4, 25, 31, 69, 81, 86, 109, 112, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 160, 180, 187, 195

Pacuvius, 41
Pallas, 39, 137, 153
Parthenius, 13, 139, 146
Pasquali, 11, 12, 15, 17
Penelope, 33, 51, 52, 53, 92, 93
perpetuum, 26, 27, 31, 39, 40, 42, 43, 68, 69, 70, 192
perpetuum…carmen, 27, 40
Pfeiffer, 1, 4, 12, 27, 30, 37, 40, 45, 46, 48, 64, 75, 78, 132
Pherecydes, 76, 77, 83, 86, 88, 95, 138
Philetas, 28, 37, 48, 61
Pindar, 41, 112, 115, 117, 122, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 138, 141, 149, 152, 157
Plato, 5, 43
Pohlenz, 30, 36, 39
Propertius, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 67, 68, 143, 148

quale, 25, 26, 42, 62, 66, 69, 84, 192
quid, 24, 25, 42, 61, 62, 84, 101, 123, 143, 192

reference, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 26, 29, 38, 39, 41, 47, 54, 61, 63, 64, 67, 73, 77, 79, 80, 84, 86, 91, 93, 96, 97, 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 116, 119, 122, 125, 129, 132, 134, 138, 139, 143, 144, 149, 165, 166, 169, 173, 177, 178, 181, 183, 184, 185
reflective allusion, 17, 20, 38, 60, 72, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 96, 100, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 126, 132, 135, 136, 141, 145, 146, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 155, 158, 161, 169, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196
Ross, 3, 13, 14, 56, 57, 64, 84, 85, 186
Rossi, 1, 6
Rutherford, 127, 128, 129, 133, 135

Shorey, 40
signpost, 73, 85, 86, 87, 112, 186, 194, 195
Simonides, 44
Svenbro, 51, 177

Tel Quel, 21
Telemachus, 33, 91, 92, 93, 96
tenor, 9, 10
tenuis, 56, 63, 64, 157
Thomas, 2, 3, 12, 14, 17, 21, 65, 85, 158
Tiresias, 22, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 179, 193
topoi, 99, 143, 153, 172, 173, 174, 175

ungrammaticality, 10

vehicle, 9, 10, 74, 157, 191
Vernant, 45, 50, 52
Virgil, 6, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 58, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 111, 161, 173, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 189, 192

West, 8, 34, 36, 39, 40, 41, 78, 82, 170
Wilamowitz, 30, 36, 39, 77, 79, 88, 107, 129

ζήλωσις, 7

SAMENVATTING IN HET NEDERLANDS

Al vele jaren benadrukken classici dat de *Metamorphoses* van Ovidius 'Kallimacheïsch' van aard is. Het bewijs voor deze overtuiging echter, is steeds voornamelijk gebaseerd geweest op algemene en subjectieve interpretaties van het werk van beide dichters. Tegelijkertijd is er de laatste jaren veel geschreven over poëtische allusie, maar deze analyses concentreerden zich op de allusieve technieken van ofwel alleen maar Latijnse, ofwel alleen maar Griekse dichters.

In deze studie worden overeenkomsten tussen compositiepatronen in poëzie onderzocht door de aandacht te concentreren op de poëtische technieken van Kallimachos en van Ovidius. Daarbij wordt gekozen voor een beperkt aantal kenmerkende plaatsen: het gaat dan in het bijzonder om de constructie en de toepassing van poëtische allusie en om een vergelijking van de effecten die de twee genoemde auteurs via allusie bereiken. Hoewel het maar één aspect is van het dichterlijk handwerk, brengt allusie alleen al door de aard van de techniek, de betrokken lezer op de hoogte van bedoelde en onbedoelde relaties tussen verschillende teksten. Om deze reden zal een onderzoek naar de manier waarop Kallimachos en Ovidius allusie hanteren, in het bijzonder op die punten waarop hun teksten 'aan elkaar raken', verhelderend zijn. De meeste studies die een systematische typologie van de activiteit van allusie aanreiken, hebben voornamelijk betrekking op ofwel Griekse, ofwel Latijnse dichters. Er zijn er maar weinigen die een poging hebben gewaagd om met behulp van één typologie de verwijzende activiteiten van een Griekse en van een Latijnse dichter op evenwichtige wijze met elkaar te vergelijken. In deze studie wordt geprobeerd om, gebruikmakend van de typologie van allusie die door de Italiaanse classicus G.B. Conte is ontwikkeld, een nieuw antwoord te geven op de vraag naar de Kallimacheïsche aard van de *Metamorphoses*. Het is een onderzoek naar en een vergelijking van de allusieve technieken van deze beide dichters. Weliswaar zijn zij van elkaar gescheiden door een afstand van ongeveer twee eeuwen, door hun cultuur en door hun taal, maar zij worden al lange tijd met elkaar in verband gebracht.

In het eerste hoofdstuk worden de theoretische fundamenten van de studie gelegd middels een bespreking van de verschillende systemen die

zijn gebruikt om poëtische allusie in Griekse en Latijnse poëzie te bediscussiëren. Uiteindelijk wordt gekozen voor de typologie van G.B. Conte, vanwege het feit dat deze heel geschikt is voor een studie naar poëtische allusie in twee verschillende oude talen.

In het tweede hoofdstuk begint het onderzoek naar de allusietechnieken van Kallimachos en Ovidius door het onderwerp te beperken tot de programmatische terminologie in de prologen van de *Metamorphoses* en de *Aetia*. Meer in het bijzonder wordt gekeken naar het gebruik op die plaatsen van de bijvoeglijke naamwoorden διηνεκὲς en λεπταλέην (en in het verlengde hiervan λεπτός), en *perpetuum* en *deductum*. Door de manier waarop Kallimachos de eerste twee bijvoeglijke naamwoorden toepast, wordt er een ‘integrative allusion’ naar Homeros gemaakt, en tevens naar de poëzie van Euripides en Aristophanes, waardoor hij aan deze adjectieven nog een connotatie toevoegt. De “Homerische” opvatting van het vertellen van een verhaal, met daarin vermelding van alle mogelijke details, διηνεκὲς, is wat Kallimachos wenst te vermijden. Door het bijvoeglijk naamwoord λεπταλέην te gebruiken, wil de dichter de suggestie wekken dat Apollo hem aanspoorde tot het maken van een subtiel en verfijnd gedicht, een fijngesponnen gedicht. De generieke implicaties van deze twee lexicale allusies betekenen nogal wat voor het begrijpen van de *Aetia*. Omdat beide termen andere genres oproepen, lijkt het erop dat ze eerder de nadruk leggen op het belang van poëtische stijl dan op poëtisch genre, althans wat dit gedicht betreft.

Het onderzoek naar Ovidius’ programmatische frase *carmen* brengt aan het licht dat er maar een paar Latijnse dichters zijn die in hun dichtkunst ofwel *perpetuum carmen*, ofwel *deductum carmen* gebruiken, en dat er nog minder zijn die deze frases hanteren in een context van programmatisch belang. Het lijkt erop dat het toepassen door de dichter van *perpetuum carmen* een ‘reflective allusion’ is op de poëzie van Horatius en Kallimachos, waarbij Ovidius’ hergebruik van de terminologie ertoe dient om een continuïteit in de tijd te benadrukken. Ovidius’ toepassing van *deducite carmen* roept een *deductum carmen* op, een fijngeweven gedicht, en is een allusie op Vergilius en Kallimachos. Ook met deze allusie heeft het er de schijn van dat Ovidius een nieuwe definitie aan deze termen geeft, doordat hij *deducite* plaatst tussen *perpetuum* en *carmen*. Op syntactische wijze geeft hij hiermee aan dat zijn gedicht zowel “Kallimacheïsch” als “niet-Kallimacheïsch” zal zijn en impliciet suggereert hij hiermee dat hij ernaar streeft een nieuwe definitie van “Kallimachisme” te geven.

Het derde hoofdstuk van het boek concentreert zich op een bredere benadering van de allusieve technieken van Ovidius en Kallimachos. Hier worden binnen afzonderlijke traditionele vertellingen meerdere lexicale allusies onderzocht. Beide dichters hanteren deze als 'markeringstechniek', met de bedoeling om de aandacht te vestigen op speciale allusieve passages in hun werk. De analyse in dit hoofdstuk dient bovendien om de definitie van allusie uit te breiden, zodat hier ook de referentiële manier waarop dichters soms traditionele vertellingen kunnen manipuleren, kan worden ingesloten.

Meer in het bijzonder laat het derde hoofdstuk zien dat Ovidius in zijn Actaeon-verhaal zowel 'integrative' als 'reflective' zinspeelt op Kallimachos' portrettering van Actaeon en Tiresias. De 'integrative allusions' naar de karakterisering en behandeling door Kallimachos van Actaeon dienen om Ovidius' eigen versie van het verhaal te bekrachtigen. Tegelijkertijd toont hij met zijn reflectieve referenties naar de Tiresias van Kallimachos dat hij zich bewust was van de behandeling door zijn voorganger van Tiresias en Actaeon, niet alleen als afzonderlijk verhaal maar ook als parallele verhalen. Deze 'reflective' referenties dienen in Ovidius' versie van het heengaan van Actaeon ter verhoging van het pathos.

In tegenstelling tot Ovidius zinspeelt Kallimachos niet 'integrative' op de bronnen van deze mythen, maar op poëzie die buiten dit domein ligt. Hij doet dit op zodanige manier dat zijn Hymne 5 wordt bevestigd als behorende tot de Griekse 'hymnische' traditie. De reflectieve aard van Kallimachos' allusie ten opzichte van zijn bronnenmateriaal onderstreept uiteindelijk zijn innovatieve behandeling van de karakters die in de hymne worden geportretteerd, in het bijzonder van Athene, het onderwerp van de hymne.

Dit hoofdstuk onderzoekt ook hoe beide dichters een interne of geïntegreerde markeringstechniek toepassen die de lezer helpt om allusieve gedeelten van de tekst te identificeren.

Het vierde hoofdstuk is nog breder van opzet waar het gaat om het aantal van de onderzochte teksten en ook wordt in dit hoofdstuk nog verder gegaan met het verschuiven van de grenzen van de definitie van allusie. De nadruk ligt op verhalen uit Hymne 6 van Kallimachos en uit boek 6 van de *Metamorphoses* van Ovidius. Beide dichters beperken zich hier niet tot lexicale allusies alleen, maar ze laten verschillende types van allusie elkaar vrijelijk afwisselen, in een reeks van met elkaar verbonden verhalen. Voorheen nog geen onderwerp van onderzoek, maar op een

aantal manieren vergelijkbaar met de markeringstechniek die besproken wordt in hoofdstuk drie, is de techniek van autorisatie waarbij de dichters binnen hun vertellingen karakters laten optreden om hun poëtisch meesterschap te bekrachtigen en om te wijzen op de reflectieve aard van de poëzie. We zien dat Kallimachos in zijn Hymne 6 op een heel systematische manier alludeert waardoor hij tegelijkertijd zijn gedicht verifieert als zijnde een hymne èn het onderscheidt van het hymnische genre. Op het eerste gezicht lijkt de manier waarop Ovidius allusies toepast minder geordend, meer organisch. Er is echter een patroon aanwijsbaar.

De Erysichthon verhalen van Ovidius en Kallimachos beschouwend, concentreert het laatste hoofdstuk zich op een aspect van allusie dat in elk voorgaand hoofdstuk al kort ter sprake is gekomen: de verhouding tussen allusie en genre. Meer specifiek gezegd onderzoekt dit hoofdstuk hoe beide dichters, binnen de context van het her-vertellen van één verhaal, een heel arsenaal van allusietypes in stelling brengen. Daarmee bereiken ze op de eerste plaats dat hun verhalen worden bevestigd als zijnde verwant aan de dichtkunst van anderen en vervolgens dat ze daarvan worden onderscheiden. Hierdoor komt het begrip van een generieke classificatie ter discussie te staan. Kallimachos en Ovidius gebruiken afwisselend 'reflective' en 'integrative allusions' om diverse genres in hun poëzie op te roepen, respectievelijk in te sluiten. Dit staat dan weer in contrast met de genres waartoe hun gedichten zo op het oog behoren en het neemt de textuur van andere genres op in hun poëzie. Het resultaat is dat de toon van elke vertelling voortdurend verschuift en dat de lezer nooit voor lange tijd voorgeschoteld krijgt wat in overeenstemming is met zijn verwachtingspatroon. Een ander gevolg van dit systeem van allusie is dat het proces van dichterlijke schepping wordt blootgelegd. Deze allusieve techniek is er één die een destabilisatie van de grenzen van dichterlijk genre suggereert, en daarmee uiteindelijk aandacht vraagt voor de mechanismen die ten grondslag liggen aan poëtische compositie.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Heather Lea van Tress was born in Richmond, Missouri, in the United States of America. In 1989 she received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Classical Languages from the University of Missouri – Columbia, and in 1992 a Master of Arts Degree in Classical Languages from Washington University in St. Louis. She began her studies for a Ph.D. in Classical Languages at the University of Iowa, but finished this work at the Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands. Through the years she has taught Greek, Latin, Rhetoric, Classical Literature in translation, and other subjects related to the Classical Languages, as well as English language and literature to adults, university and secondary school students. Currently she is continuing her research and writing while teaching Greek, Latin and English at a gymnasium in the Netherlands.

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.S. VERSNEL, I.J.F. DE JONG AND P. H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series

175. ROSSUM-STEENBEEK, M. VAN. *Greek Readers' Digests?* Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10953 6
176. McMAHON, J.M. *Paralysin Cave*. Impotence, Perception, and Text in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10825 4
177. ISAAC, B. *The Near East under Roman Rule*. Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10736 3
178. KEEN, A.G. *Dynastic Lycia*. A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10956 0
179. GEORGIADOU, A. & D.H.J. LARMOUR. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10667 7
180. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11008 9
181. HUNT, T.J. *A Textual History of Cicero's* Academici Libri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10970 6
182. HAMEL, D. *Athenian Generals*. Military Authority in the Classical Period. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10900 5
183. WHITBY, M. (ed.). *The Propaganda of Power*. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10571 9
184. SCHRIER, O.J. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle and the* Tractatus Coislinianus. A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11132 8
185. SICKING, C.M.J. *Distant Companions*. Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11054 2
186. SCHRIJVERS, P.H. *Lucrèce et les Sciences de la Vie*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10230 2
187. BILLERBECK M. (Hrsg.). *Seneca*. Hercules Furens. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11245 6
188. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Signs of Orality*. The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11273 1
189. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *Roman Epic*. An Interpretative Introduction. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11292 8
190. HOUT, M.P.J. VAN DEN. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. KRAUS, C. SHUTTLEWORTH. (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography*. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. LOMAS, K. & T. CORNELL. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy*. ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *History of Greek Colonization and Settlement Overseas*. 2 vols. ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. WOOD, S.E. *Imperial Women*. A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN & P. STORK. *Linguistics into Interpretation*. Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5

197. PFEIJFFER, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar*. A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid 7. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. IRBY-MASSIE, G.L. *Military Religion in Roman Britain*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. GRAINGER, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable*. I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. GRAINGER, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. SOLOMON, J. *Ptolemy* Harmonics. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 115919
204. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book VI*. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. MADER, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography*. Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. NAUTA, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons*. Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable*. II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. JAMES, A. & K. LEE. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3
209. DERDERIAN, K. *Leaving Words to Remember*. Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11750 4
210. SHORROCK, R. *The Challenge of Epic*. Allusive Engagement in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11795 4
211. SCHEIDEL, W. (ed.). *Debating Roman Demography*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11525 0
212. KEULEN, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca* Troades. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12004 1
213. MORTON, J. *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11717 2
214. GRAHAM, A.J. *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11634 6
215. GROSSARDT, P. *Die Erzählung von Meleagros*. Zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11952 3
216. ZAFIROPOULOS, C.A. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The* Augustana *Collection*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11867 5
217. RENGAKOS, A. & T.D. PAPANGHELIS (eds.). *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11752 0
218. WATSON, J. *Speaking Volumes*. Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12049 1
219. MACLEOD, L. *Dolos and Dike in Sophokles'* Elektra. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11898 5
220. MCKINLEY, K.L. *Reading the Ovidian Heroine*. "Metamorphoses" Commentaries 1100-1618. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11796 2
221. REESON, J. *Ovid* Heroides *11, 13 and 14*. A Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12140 4
222. FRIED, M.N. & S. UNGURU. *Apollonius of Perga's* Conica: Text, Context, Subtext. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11977 9
223. LIVINGSTONE, N. *A Commentary on Isocrates'* Busiris. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12143 9
224. LEVENE, D.S. & D.P. NELIS (eds.). *Clio and the Poets*. Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11782 2
225. WOOTEN, C.W. *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12213 3

226. GALÁN VIOQUE, G. *Martial, Book VII. A Commentary*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12338 5
227. LEFÈVRE, E. *Die Unfähigkeit, sich zu erkennen: Sophokles' Tragödien*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12322 9
228. SCHEIDEL, W. *Death on the Nile*. Disease and the Demography of Roman Egypt. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12323 7
229. SPANOUDAKIS, K. *Philitas of Cos*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12428 4
230. WORTHINGTON, I. & J.M. FOLEY (eds.). *Epea and Grammata*. Oral and written Communication in Ancient Greece. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12455 1
231. McKECHNIE, P. (ed.). *Thinking Like a Lawyer*. Essays on Legal History and General History for John Crook on his Eightieth Birthday. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12474 8
232. GIBSON, R.K. & C. SHUTTLEWORTH KRAUS (eds.). *The Classical Commentary*. Histories, Practices, Theory. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12153 6
233. JONGMAN, W. & M. KLEIJWEGT (eds.). *After the Past*. Essays in Ancient History in Honour of H.W. Pleket. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12816 6
234. GORMAN, V.B. & E.W. ROBINSON (eds.). *Oikistes*. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12579 5
235. HARDER, A., R. REGTUIT, P. STORK & G. WAKKER (eds.). *Noch einmal zu....* Kleine Schriften von Stefan Radt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12794 1
236. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Latin Fable*. Volume Three: Inventory and Documentation of the Graeco-Latin Fable. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11891 8
237. SCHADE, G. *Stesichoros*. Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2359, 3876, 2619, 2803. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12832 8
238. ROSEN, R.M. & I. SLUITER (eds.) *Andreia*. Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11995 7
239. GRAINGER, J.D. *The Roman War of Antiochos the Great*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12840 9
240. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Tertia*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12977 4
241. PANAYOTAKIS, S., M. ZIMMERMAN & W. KEULEN (eds.). *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12999 5
242. ZACHARIA, K. C*onverging Truths*. Euripides' *Ion* and the Athenian Quest for Self-Definition. 2003. ISBN 90 0413000 4
243. ALMEIDA, J.A. *Justice as an Aspect of the Polis Idea in Solon's Political Poems*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13002 0
244. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid *11*. A Commentary. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12934 0
245. VON ALBRECHT, M. *Cicero's Style*. A Synopsis. Followed by Selected Analytic Studies. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12961 8
246. LOMAS, K. *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean*. Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13300 3
247. SCHENKEVELD, D.M. *A Rhetorical Grammar*. C. Iullus Romanus, Introduction to the Liber de Adverbio. 2004. ISBN 90 04 133662 2
248. MACKIE, C.J. *Oral Performance and its Context*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13680 0
249. RADICKE, J. *Lucans Poetische Technik*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13745 9
250. DE BLOIS, L., J. BONS, T. KESSELS & D.M. SCHENKEVELD (eds.). *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works*. Volume I: Plutarch's Statesman and his Aftermath: Political, Philosophical, and Literary Aspects. ISBN 90 04 13795 5. Volume II: The Statesman in Plutarch's Greek and Roman Lives. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13808 0
251. GREEN, S.J. *Ovid,* Fasti *1*. A Commentary. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13985 0
252. VON ALBRECHT, M. *Wort und Wandlung*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13988 5
253. KORTEKAAS, G.A.A. *The Story of Apollonius, King of Tyre*. A Study of Its Greek Origin and an Edition of the Two Oldest Latin Recensions. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13923 0
254. SLUITER, I. & R.M. ROSEN (eds.). *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13925 7
255. STODDARD, K. *The Narrative Voice in the* Theogony *of Hesiod*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14002 6

256. FITCH, J.G. *Annaeana Tragica.* Notes on the Text of Seneca's Tragedies. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14003 4
257. DE JONG, I.J.F., R. NÜNLIST & A. BOWLE (eds.). *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature.* Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume One. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13927 3